Myth, Ritual, and the Warrior in Roman and Indo-European Antiquity

Roger D. Woodard

Cambridge

VISIT...

Myth, Ritual, and the Warrior in Roman and Indo-European Antiquity

Roger D. Woodard

Cambridge

Myth, Ritual, and the Warrior in Roman and Indo-European Antiquity

Roger D. Woodard examines the figure of the returning warrior as depicted in the myths of several ancient and medieval Indo-European cultures. In these cultures, the returning warrior was often portrayed as a figure rendered dysfunctionally destructive or isolationist by the horrors of combat. This mythic portrayal of the returned warrior is consistent with modern studies of similar behavior among soldiers returning from war.

Woodard's research identifies a common origin of these myths in the ancestral Proto-Indo-European culture, in which rites were enacted to enable warriors to reintegrate themselves as functional members of society. Woodard also compares the Italic, Indo-Iranian, and Celtic mythic traditions surrounding the warrior, paying particular attention to Roman myth and ritual, notably to the aetiologies and rites of the July festivals of the Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae and to the October rites of the Sororium Tigillum.

ROGER D. WOODARD is the Andrew van Vranken Raymond Professor of the Classics and Professor of Linguistics at the University of Buffalo, The State University of New York. His many published books include *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology*; *Indo-European Sacred Space: Vedic and Roman Cult; Indo-European Myth and Religion: A Manual; Ovid: Fasti* (with A. J. Boyle)*; The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages; Greek Writing from Knossos to Homer: A Linguistic Interpretation of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and the Continuity of Ancient Greek Literacy;* and *On Interpreting Morphological Change: The Greek Reflexive Pronoun*.

Myth, Ritual, and the Warrior in Roman and Indo-European Antiquity

Roger D. Woodard

University of Buffalo
The State University of New York

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107022409

© Roger D. Woodard 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data
Woodard, Roger D.
Myth, ritual, and the warrior in Roman and Indo-European antiquity / Roger Woodard.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-107-02240-9 (hardback)
1. Indo-European antiquities. 2. Soldiers in literature. 3. Mythology, Roman, in literature. I. Title.
P525.W66 2013
930′.04034–dc23 2012007843

ISBN 978-1-107-02240-9 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For my father, RDW,

who was saved from the warrior's fate by the accident of time and place,

and

For my mother, WOW,

who, like countless mothers before and since, knew Thetis's dread, but was spared its realization.

Contents

Preface
Acknowledgments

1 People Flee
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 The Poplifugia: People Flee
- 1.3 Nonae Caprotinae: People Advance
  - 1.3.1 Ritual Rehearsals
- 1.4 Matters of Fertility
  - 1.4.1 Consus and the Nones of July
  - 1.4.2 Pales and the Nones of July
- 1.5 Some Conclusions

2 And Romulus Disappears
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 On a Conflation of Days
  - 2.2.1 July 7: Romulus Disappears
  - 2.2.2 July 5: Romulus Disappears
  - 2.2.3 July 5 and July 7 as the Nones
  - 2.2.4 Different – But the Same
- 2.3 Variant Aetiologies
- 2.4 The Poplifugia and the Crisis of the Warrior
  - 2.4.1 Crisis of the Invading Enemy
  - 2.4.2 Crisis of the Disappearing Romulus
- 2.5 The Problem of Direction
- 2.6 Some Conclusions

3 At the Shrines of Vulcan
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Regicide and the Sanctuary of Vulcan
  - 3.2.1 The Sanctuary of Vulcan in Comitio
  - 3.2.2 Locus Funestus; Locus Optimus
  - 3.2.3 The Sanctuary of Vulcan in Campo
- 3.3 Language of the Forbidden: Part 1
  - 3.3.1 Consus and Tutulina
  - 3.3.2 Numa Pompilius
- 3.4 Days of the Forbidden
- 3.5 Language of the Forbidden: Part 2
- 3.6 Some Conclusions

4 Where Space Varies
4.1 Introduction
4.2 What's in a Name?
4.3 Boundary and Movement
4.3.1 The Disappearance of Romulus in Comitio
4.3.2 The Pomerium and the Sanctuaries of Vulcan
4.3.3 Priest, Warrior, Populus: Rituals of Space Transcended
4.4 The Smaller Poplifugium
4.5 The Larger Poplifugium
4.5.1 The Disappearance of Romulus in Campo
4.6 Some Conclusions
5 Warriors in Crisis
5.1 Introduction
5.2 Overview of the Dysfunctional Warrior
5.2.1 The Indic Warrior
5.2.2 The Irish Warrior
5.2.3 The Italic Warrior
5.3 Roman Cult Tradition
5.3.1 The Pre-Capitoline Triad
5.3.2 Calendar and Cult
5.3.3 Temporal Anomalies: Wrinkles in Time
5.3.4 Warrior-Crisis and the Conflation of Days
5.4 Some Conclusions
6 Structures: Matrix and Continuum
6.1 Introduction
6.2 Feature (1): Crisis of the Warrior
6.2.1 The Contemporary Case: The American Warrior
6.2.2 The Ancient Case: The Indic, Irish, and Italic Warrior
6.2.3 Roman Ritual Aetiology and the Crisis of the Warrior
6.3 Camillus and the Crisis of the Warrior
6.3.1 The ἕτερος λόγος: Camillus, the Second Romulus
6.3.2 The Integration of Myth along an Axis of Historicity
6.4 Some Conclusions
7 Remote Spaces
7.1 Introduction
7.2 The Indic Warrior
7.3 The Irish Warrior
7.4 The Italic Warrior
7.4.1 Semo Sancus
7.4.2 The Aventine and the Pomerium
7.5 Roman Ritual

7.5.1 Ritual Enunciation
7.6 Some Conclusions
8 Erotic Women and the (Un)Averted Gaze
8.1 Introduction
8.2 The Irish Warrior
8.3 The Italic Warrior
8.3.1 Tiresias and the Unaverted Gaze
8.4 The Indo-Iranian Warrior
8.4.1 The Indic Warrior
8.4.2 The Armenian Warrior
8.4.3 The Nart Warrior
8.4.4 The Erotic Feminine in Indo-Iranian Tradition
8.5 The Debilitating Gaze
8.5.1 The Indic Warrior and His Stand-in
8.5.2 The Nart Warrior
8.6 Fire and the Feminine: The Recovery of the Warrior
8.6.1 Fire and Monovalency
8.6.2 Fire and Feminine Agency
8.7 Roman Ritual – and Myth
8.7.1 The Poplifugia/Nonae Caprotinae
8.7.2 Horatius and Horatia
8.8 Some Conclusions
9 Clairvoyant Women
9.1 Introduction
9.2 The Indo-Iranian Warrior
9.2.1 The Indic Warrior
9.2.2 The Iranian Warrior
9.3 The Irish Warrior
9.4 The Italic Warrior
9.5 Roman Ritual
9.5.1 Fire and the Feminine
9.5.2 Naming the Clairvoyant Woman
9.6 Some Conclusions
10 Watery Spaces
10.1 Introduction
10.2 The Indo-Iranian Warrior
10.2.1 The Indic Warrior
10.2.2 The Iranian Warrior
10.3 The Irish Warrior
10.4 The Italic Warrior
10.5 Roman Ritual
10.5.1 The Caprae Palus
10.5.2 The Comitium

10.6 Some Conclusions
11 Return to Order
11.1 Introduction
11.2 The Indo-Iranian Warrior
11.2.1 The Indic Warrior
11.2.2 The Iranian Warrior
11.3 The Irish Warrior
11.4 The Italic Warrior
11.4.1 Semo Sancus and Indra
11.4.2 The Second Romulus and the Roman Return to Order
11.5 Roman Ritual
11.5.1 The Sororium Tigillum
11.5.2 The Poplifugia
11.5.3 Romulus, Numa, and the Mythic Matrix
11.6 Some Conclusions
12 Further Conclusions and Interpretations

Bibliography
Index

Preface

Particularly vivid memories surviving from a 1950s childhood are those of riding in the back seat of a 1951 Pontiac coupe, speeding along eastern North Carolina rural roads on periodic night runs from my grandparent's home to my own, some fifty miles away. A thick and marvelous darkness and nocturnal stillness engulfed the car and its passengers mile after mile. Inevitably the immediacy of the sheltering blackness that wrapped the world would reluctantly and briefly recede as the car approached the lights of the small Johnston County town of Kenly. The patience demanded by a slow trawl through the deserted three or four blocks of the town's main street was rewarded by a rapid re-acceleration into deep darkness.

Some nights, however, bathed in the light of the tall street lamp that stood at the corner of Church and Second, there would be standing a man – a man as brilliantly illuminated against the surrounding darkness as any actor who has ever plied the tragedizing craft beneath a spotlight in any theater gone dark. The man – if he *was* a man – and not some infernal apparition drawn to the light like the bats that flew overhead gorging on moths – and he must have been a man, for he had a name – let us call him B. – raged like a storm. With flailing limbs and taut, arching spine he fought an enemy that none could see – none but B. His face was contorted, more beastly than human, and from between corrugated lips, harshly misshapen by the fury that possessed him, there poured incomprehensible streams of screaming speech.

As the Pontiac sped on into the night, the driver – my father – would predictably utter, in a still voice weighted down by empathy: "He was in the war – he was shell-shocked."

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder – America's military involvement in Vietnam brought it to our attention. More recent forays into the Asian world have kept it there. Its later twentieth- and twenty-first-century manifestations made many – at least in America – almost forget that it was a phenomenon of the great World Wars as well; but fortunately there have been those who rekindled the memory.[1] Yet it is a scourge that did not begin with the horrors of the Somme. Recent work has extended our awareness: during and following the American Civil War, Union and Confederate soldiers alike suffered in its grip.[2] It is,

however, a debilitating disorder far, far older than that conflict. How could it not be? The ancient warrior knew it too;[3] and ancient society wrestled with its consequences.

This book begins with a close examination of two ancient Roman festivals, celebrated annually on July 5 and July 7. The two are variations on a single theme, which I argue is that of the response of society to the post-combat dysfunctionality of the warrior. It is an expression of an ideology and practices inherited by the Romans from their own ancestors: the festivals are ritual realizations of a mythic motif that is widely attested among Indo-European peoples, of whom the Romans are but one. The motif is that of the rage and isolationism exhibited by the Indo-European warrior following combat: certain fundamental features characterize the ancestral mythic tradition and the Roman festivals alike – features that constitute elements of the warrior's experience and society's response to that experience.

Following an overview of the several Indo-European mythic traditions and of elements of Roman cult, each of these fundamental features is examined in turn over the course of six chapters, together with their various expressions in historical Indo-European cultures. The book concludes with summary and interpretative thoughts on ancestral Indo-European ritual practices and the Roman instantiations of those practices from the particular perspective preserved in, among other rites, those of July 5 and July 7.

> Feast Day of St. Thomas Becket
> "My Lord! these are not men, these come not as men come, but
> Like maddened beasts"
> The Priest to Becket at the approach of the Knights
>
> T. S. Eliot, *Murder in the Cathedral*

[1] Such as Shephard 2001; Barham 2004; Childers 2009.

[2] See Dean 1997.

[3] See, for example, the comparisons made between ancient Greek combat experience and that of Vietnam-era GIs in Palaima 2000; Shay 1994, 2002; and Tritle 2000. See also, *inter alia*, Tatum 2003; Weil (Holoka) 2003; as well as Tuchman 1997.

Acknowledgments

Voicing one's gratitude to individuals who have provided inspiration, assistance, and support for an undertaking such as this one always elicits a certain degree of discomfort when one realizes the breadth and width of the debt and the impossibility of adequately acknowledging all deserving of such recognition. This, however, does not provide the author with an excuse to invoke non-offending silence in the matter of thanks. And so, beyond those scholars upon whose work I build, who are credited by name in the pages that follow (with apologies to any whose work I have overlooked and those whose contributions have been obscured by the passage of time), there are some particular individuals who must be singled out.

Much of the research and a sizeable portion of the composing of this work were undertaken while I was visiting at the American Academy in Rome during the summers of 2009 and 2010 and at Wolfson College Oxford during Trinity term 2010. Special thanks go to the President of the American Academy, Adele Chatfield-Taylor, and the Academy's Director, Christopher Celenza, and his predecessor Carmella Franklin, and to the President of Wolfson College, Hermione Lee, and to the administrative staff at both institutions (particularly Cristina Puglisi, Pina Pasquantonio, and Gianpaolo Battaglia at the Academy and Sue Hales, Alan George, and Rose Truby at Wolfson) for their essential and kind support. I am much indebted for the library resources made available to me by both institutions – especially the Arthur and Janet Ross Library in Rome and the Wolfson College Library and Bodleian facilities in Oxford – and to the always helpful and devoted staff members (Paolo Brozzi, Denise Gavio, and Paolo Imperatori in Rome and Fiona Wilkes in Oxford, among others) of these collections of inestimable worth.

Special thanks also to the many colleagues in both Rome and Oxford who allowed me to share with them my thoughts about Roman religion, the Poplifugia, and the trials of the ancient warrior, for their patient and receptive ears and their invaluable feedback. In this regard I think particularly of Corey Brennan, Larissa Bonfante, Peter Knox, Jim Packer, Angus Bowie, Armand D'Angour, Robert Parker, and, especially, Nick Allen. I would be remiss were I not to express my appreciation for daily sustenance in Rome to Mona Talbott and the Rome Sustainable Food Project, and to her remarkable staff, especially

Francesca Gilberti. Thanks to John Kamitsuka for the inspiration of both his musical genius and the work ethic that attends it.

A heartfelt thank-you goes once again to Beatrice Rehl of Cambridge University Press, and to her assistant Emily Spangler, for immaculate professionalism and unswerving wisdom. And many thanks go to Ronald Cohen for his editing expertise and dedication to the manuscript of this book.

Last of all, and most of all, as ever, thanks to Katherine and Paul, *sine quibus non*.

1 People Flee

1.1 Introduction

The ancient Roman calendars record that on July 5 – that is, on the *fifth* day of the *fifth* month of the old ten-month calendar[1] – there were celebrated the rites of the Poplifugia. At face value, the name of the festival simply, and with little revelation, denotes the 'flight of the people'. On the nomenclature, Dumézil remarks:[2]

> As for the Poplifugia, they are for us only a name, notable in that, unlike the singular *regifugium*, the form is plural. This is also the only festival of the year to be placed in that part of the month that precedes the Nones. The first point urges an interpretation of *-fugia*, following that of the ancient writers, as 'multiple flights, disorderly and in confusion' . . .

As Dumézil notes, the festival's placement within the Roman calendar is a conspicuous one: it is the *only* festival marked in large capitals that occurs between the Kalends and the Nones[3] in any month of the year.[4] The uniqueness and markedness of its calendrical positioning must certainly be of considerable import for understanding the ritual significance of the occasion (see §5.3.3).

1.2 The Poplifugia: People Flee

The Poplifugia came to be associated with various events, historical – or mythic-historical – in much the same way that the Regifugium, the 'Flight of the *Rex*' (celebrated annually on February 24) was secondarily attached to the driving out of the Etruscan king (*rex*).[5] According to Varro (*De lingua Latina* 6.18), the Poplifugia commemorate the retreat of the Romans when neighboring peoples marched against them subsequent to the Gallic conquest of Rome in 387 BC (see also §2.2.3):

> . . . *ut Ficuleates ac Fidenates et finitimi alii, contra nos coniurarunt. Aliquot huius diei vestigia fugae in sacris apparent, de quibus rebus Antiquitatum Libri plura referunt.*
>
> . . . such as the Ficuleans and Fidenians and other neighbors,

> [who] conspired against us. Some vestiges of the flight of this day appear in the rites, about which matters the *Books of the Antiquities*[6] have more to report.

Though as Warde Fowler pointed out long ago (1899:175): ". . . the large capitals in which the name Poplifugia appears in the fragments of the three calendars which preserve it are sufficient evidence that it must have been far older than the Gallic invasion" (for the three calendars, see §2.2.4). For Varro, then, the hostile peoples are Rome's neighbors in Latium; he names two. One force is that of the people of Fidenae, the town located some five miles north of Rome on the Via Salaria, a perpetual enemy subjugated by Rome in 498 BC,[7] but with later insurrections.[8] The other is that of the people of Ficulea, about whom relatively little is recorded in antiquity: Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antiquitates Romanae* 1.16.5) writes that the town was founded by the Ἀβοριγῖνες 'Aborigines'; Livy (1.38.4) identifies it as one of the ancient Latin towns that had been subdued by Tarquinius Priscus – to which claim Alföldi responds: "Ficulea lost its independence in the same years as Fidenae, and not under King Tarquinius Priscus."[9]

Macrobius (*Saturnalia* 3.2.14), on the other hand, in a passing mention of the festival, links the celebration of the Poplifugia with the retreat of the Romans from an Etruscan force – a trope reminiscent of that of the Regifugium with its aetiological associations with the expelling of the Etruscan Tarquins. In describing this commemoration, Macrobius conflates the day of the Poplifugia with the Nones of July – that is, July 7 – as do other ancient authorities (see Chapter 2). The ritual events of the Poplifugia (July 5) and the Nones (July 7) are undoubtedly conceptually related, as we shall see, and as has often been observed. Dumézil, for example, here referring to the Nones of July as the *Nonae Caprotinae* (on which see immediately following) writes, following upon his remarks cited above (see §1.1):[10]

> . . . the second [point (in other words, his point that the Poplifugia are the only festival preceding the Nones)] invites the scholar to see in the Poplifugia a prelude to the festival that immediately follows them, the Nonae Caprotinae, which are themselves exceptional if not anomalous, as they are the only festival during the year attached to the Nones.

Thus, not only is the placement of the Poplifugia between the Kalends and the Nones an anomaly, but the in-some-way affiliated Nonae Caprotinae follow suit in their aberrant temporal positioning: there is

something markedly peculiar about the calendrical assignment of these ritual events (see §5.3.3).

1.3 Nonae Caprotinae: People Advance

In Roman tradition as preserved by Plutarch in his *Life of Camillus* 33.1–7 and *Life of Romulus* 29.3–6, these Nones of July are linked with the previously mentioned hostility of Rome's neighbors following the Gallic incursion. In *Life of Camillus* 33.1, Plutarch identifies three Italic-speaking groups as invading Roman territory – Aequi, Volsci, and Latins – and writes of Tuscans attacking the city of Sutrium in Etruria, a place that Plutarch identifies as an ally of Rome's. In *Life of Romulus* 29.3, the hostile force is composed of Latins led by Livius Postumius. In addition to his *Etruscan* aetiology mentioned earlier (*Sat.* 3.2.14; see §1.2), Macrobius (conflating the Poplifugia and the Nones) also knows and rehearses the tradition of a *Latin* threat, making reference to Fidenae and the *dictator* Postumius Livius (*Sat.* 1.11.37).[11] At *Life of Camillus* 33.2, Plutarch rehearses how the Latins demanded that the Romans surrender to them all free Roman virgins (παρθένους ἐλευθέρας γυναῖκας); at *Life of Romulus* 29.4, it is virgins and women without husbands – an arrangement that the Latin commander likens to Romulus's abduction of the Sabine women. For Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.11.37), the demand is for *matresfamilias . . . et virgines* 'married women and virgins'.

While the Roman magistrates were at a complete loss (ἀπορέω; *Cam.* 33.2; *Rom.* 29.4) as to what they should do in the face of such a demand, an unlikely deliverer stepped forward: a clever and competent slave-woman, Philotis or Tutula (*Cam.* 33.3; Tutola at *Rom.* 29.4; Macrobius [*Sat.* 1.11.38] attests the name as Tutela), who persuaded the Roman magistrates to send a group of Roman female slaves in the place of the free women. Dressed as "well-born brides," the slave-women were conducted to the camp of the Latins (*Cam.* 33.2–4), where the women plied the enemy warriors with wine (Macrobius *Sat.* 1.11.39), exhausted them τῇ ἀλήκτῳ συνουσίᾳ 'with constant copulation' (Ps-Plutarch *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30[12]), and then disarmed them during the night as they slept. What happened next is summarily rehearsed by Macrobius in these words: *ex arbore caprifico quae castris erat proxima signum Romanis dederunt* 'from a wild fig tree [literally 'goat fig'] which stood near the camp, they gave a signal to the Romans' (*Sat.* 1.11.39–40). Plutarch provides the details: the architect of this plan and leader of the slave-women, Tutula (Tutola/Tutela) or Philotis, climbed into a tall wild fig tree (a *caprificus*) and hoisted a torch toward Rome (εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην), having extended her cloak (τὸ ἱμάτιον) behind her – understand, so as to

prevent the enemy forces from seeing the flame (*Cam.* 33.4). In the corresponding account in the *Life of Romulus* (29.5–6), Plutarch writes that Philotis shimmied up the fig tree –

> . . . περισχοῦσα προκαλύμμασι καὶ παραπετάσμασιν ὄπισθεν, ὥστε τοῖς πολεμίοις ἀόρατον εἶναι τὸ φῶς, τοῖς δὲ Ῥωμαίοις κατάδηλον.
>
> . . . holding out coverings and hangings behind her, so that for the enemy the light was unseen, but to the Romans it was visible.

The noun τὸ προκάλυμμα[13] can identify various types of 'covering' – curtains and protective covers. Similarly τὸ παραπέτασμα[14] denotes various implements that can be spread out – for example 'tapestry,' 'curtain'. The described maneuver is surely an awkward one at best, if not practically ineffectual; but it is a salient element of the tradition as attested by the care exercised by the author in detailing the event. The torch was a fire-signal to waiting Roman magistrates, who immediately mustered the army; the Romans advanced on the camp and slaughtered the exhausted and disarmed sleeping Latins.

In *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30, Ps-Plutarch varies the account to make the enemy force Gallic rather than Latin, led by a Gallic king, Atepomarus.[15] Ovid (*Ars amatoria* 2.257–258) embraces this variant as well, writing of this day, the Nonae Caprotinae day, calendrically designated as the *Ancillarum Feriae* 'Festival of the Slave-Women' (see §2.2.3):

> *Porrige et ancillae, qua poenas luce pependit*
> *Lusa maritali Gallica veste manus.*
> Offer [a gift] to the slave-woman too, on the day when
> Tricked by a bridal gown the Gallic hoard paid the price.

The adept leader of the slave-women is given the name Rhetana by Ps-Plutarch, who also records a variant signaling event: rather than clambering up a wild fig situated at some distance with torch in hand and a makeshift screen stretched behind her, Rhetana uses the *caprificus* to pull herself εἰς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ μηνύει τοῖς ὑπάτοις 'onto the wall and disclose [matters] to the consuls' – a tête-à-tête conducted by the wily seductress rather than a distant signal by means of fire.

1.3.1 Ritual Rehearsals

The component elements of the aetiological event are re-enacted ritually on the Nones of July (July 7). The rites thus entail throngs of

people (ἀθρόοι) exiting the gate of the city, and who, as they go, πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων καὶ κοινῶν ὀνομάτων βοῇ φθέγγονται, Γάϊον, Μάρκον, Λούκιον καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια 'enunciate with a shout many of the local and common names – Gaius, Marcus, Lucius, and ones similar to these'. Plutarch (*Cam.* 33.5) states that the enunciative act replicates an earlier such calling out (ἀνάκλησις) conducted in haste; the reference is plainly to the tumultuous mustering of Roman soldiers, who called to one another as they arranged themselves in formation and set out in response to Tutula's signal, which Plutarch has described a few lines prior (*Cam.* 33.4). We shall encounter this enunciative act again in a slightly different setting (see §2.3; 7.5.1).

A second ritual element also involves a movement through space accompanied by a verbal act. Brilliantly attired female slaves (θεραπαινίδες) go around παίζουσαι διὰ σκωμμάτων εἰς τοὺς ἁπαντῶντας (which one could translate literally, but stiffly, as) 'toying by means of jokes with all of the men' (*Cam.* 33.6). The word here translated 'joke', τὸ σκῶμμα, "generally implies," as Liddell and Scott phrase it, "scurrility":[16] this enunciative behavior of the slave-women must surely constitute a bawdy verbal commemoration of the aggressive sexual accomplishments of Tutula and her followers in the camp of the enemy warriors. In his Satire 1, Persius alludes to one of the ritual celebrants, or else proverbially to a woman who behaves in a comparable manner, when he writes (line 133) of a lascivious *nonaria* (literally a 'Nones-woman') tugging on a Cynic's beard: Persius typifies this as the sort of act that the small-minded find to be hilarious.[17] In addition to engaging in bawdy banter and whisker-wrenching, these erotically charged women engage in a mock fight (Plutarch *Cam.* 33.6), even throwing stones at each other (*Rom.* 29.6) – a spectacle looking to be the Roman equivalent of cat-fighting or mud-wrestling.[18]

On this day, Roman women, both free and slave, also present a sacrifice to *Juno Caprotina* beneath a *caprificus*, using the milky sap of the tree in their sacrificial offering; hence, we are told, the day of the sacrifice is called the *Nonae Caprotinae* (Varro, *Ling.* 6.18; Macrobius *Sat.* 1.11.36, 40). Varro adds, without clarification, that the women *e caprifico adhibent virgam* 'use a branch from a wild fig tree'. Plutarch writes that the women feast while shaded κλάδοις συκῆς 'by branches from a wild fig' (*Cam.* 33.6; *Rom.* 29.6). The sacrifice takes place in an area of the Campus Martius called the *Caprae Palus* 'Goat's Marsh' (Plutarch *Rom.* 29.2; see also 27.6;[19] for the name of the place, see also Livy 1.16.1, Florus 1.1.1.16–17 [cf. Ovid *Fasti* 2.491]; Plutarch *Life of Numa* 2.1). Varro succinctly, and intriguingly, records that the sacrifice to Juno Caprotina occurs *in Latio* 'in Latium', unmistakably

and enticingly suggesting that the rite is not unique to Rome. In this regard, Whatmough[20] interpreted an inscription (CIL I^2 2439–2440) reported to have been found in the vicinity of neighboring Praeneste as bearing a dedication to Juno Paloscaria, with the epithet derived from *palusca* (earlier **palosca*), naming a type of fig (*atra palusca* [*ficus*]; see Macrobius *Sat.* 3.20.1).[21]

1.4 Matters of Fertility

It is clear that the narrated events of the Nones of July, the Nonae Caprotinae, are intimately concerned with matters of fertility – from the ritual rehearsal of the Latin attempt to acquire Roman women and the consequent sexual activity of the slave-women to the conspicuous elements of goat (reminiscent of the fertility rites of the Lupercalia[22]) and of fig and the milk-like sap of the *caprificus* (reminiscent of the *Ruminalis ficus* 'Ruminal fig',[23] where a she-wolf suckled the infant Romulus and Remus[24]) used in offerings to Juno Caprotina: "both animal and plant contribute a great deal of sexual symbolism."[25]

1.4.1 Consus and the Nones of July

But there is more to this day that concerns fecundity. Tertullian (*De spectaculis* 5) records that on the Nones of July, sacrifice is also made to Consus (see §3.3.1), god of grain in storage, on his subterranean altar (buried in the Circus Maximus) by the *sacerdotes publici* 'public priests'. The god's principal festivals are the Consualia of August 21 and of December 15. At the former, Tertullian notes, the officiating priests were the Flamines of Quirinus, the Roman god principally embodying the ideological realm of the goods-producer and fecundity (Dumézil's *troisième fonction* 'third function'[26]), and the Vestal Virgins. Both the summer and winter Consualia are followed in four days time by a festival of Ops, goddess of abundant harvest – the *Opiconsivia* on August 25 and the *Opalia* on December 19 – which together with the two Consualia constitute a ritual nexus in celebration of Roman fecundity.[27] The rites of the Nonae Caprotinae align themselves with this nexus.

1.4.2 Pales and the Nones of July

And there is yet more. The Republican era calendar from Actium marks the date of July 7, the Nones of July, with the entry *Palibus II* 'for two Pales'. The deity Pales,[28] associated with the fertility of domesticated animals and typically depicted as female,[29] is a figure of great antiquity, as revealed by the dedication to her of one of the

twelve archaic priests called the Flamines Minores:[30] hers is the Flamen Palatualis (Festus pp. 244–245M; cf. Varro *Ling.* 7.45). Pales has a better-known festival, celebrated on April 21, day of the *Parilia* – also identified as Rome's foundation date[31] – when Romulus ploughed the perimeter of the Palatine city (see Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 1.88.2–3; Ovid, *Fasti* 4.806–862). Athenaeus writes that in his time (ca. AD 200) the day had undergone a name change (*Deipnosophistae* 8.361): δὲ οὖσα ἑορτὴ τὰ Παρίλια μὲν πάλαι καλουμένη, νῦν δὲ Ῥωμαῖα 'being the festival called the *Parilia* long ago, but now the *Romaea*'. And the same day is also said to be by coincidence the birthday of Rome's second king, Numa Pompilius (see Plutarch, *Num.* 3.4).

1.4.2.1 The Parilia.

The Parilia of April 21 are a celebration of and for the increase of livestock. Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.88.3) writes that οἱ γεωργοὶ καὶ νομεὶς 'cultivators and shepherds' offer thanksgiving sacrifices περὶ γονῆς τετραπόδων 'for the offspring of four-footed animals'. Ovid identifies the desired outcome of the rites of Pales in a prayer he would place on the lips of her worshippers (*Fasti* 4.747–776):[32] (1) protection of herds and herders (lines 747–748; see §§1.4.2.1.3–1.4.2.1.4); (2) forgiveness for unintended violation of sacred pastoral spaces and for disturbing the deities of such spaces (lines 749–762; see §1.4.2.1.1); and (3) health, nourishment, abundant fertility for flocks and herd, and thus profit and plenty for the herder (lines 763–774; see §1.4.2.1.2). The sentiments of the prayer, and their fundamental phrasing, must be rooted in remote antiquity, if the poet has adapted the words to his metrical needs and expressive ends.

The three-fold goal of Ovid's petition to Pales recalls that of the prayer preserved by Cato in *De agricultura* 141, as explicated by Benveniste,[33] reflecting the threefold ideological categorizing of primitive Indo-European society (i.e., *les trois fonctions*, à la Dumézil [see §1.4.1 and, especially, immediately following], which can equally be denoted as *les trois classes* by Benveniste[34]) – a segmenting into priests, warriors, and pastoralist-cultivators. The relevant lines of Cato's prayer follow, divided into two sections here, marked (1) and (2), presenting respectively a litany of woes, with the concatenated governing verbs (a–c), and a litany of desired benefits (d–f):[35]

1)

Woes

Mars pater, te precor quaesoque uti sies volens propitius mihi domo familiaeque nostrae, quoius re ergo agrum terram fundumque meum

suovitaurilia circumagi iussi, uti tu (a) *morbos visos invisosque*, (b) *viduertatem vastitudinemque*, (c) *calamitates intemperiasque* (a) *prohibessis* (b) *defendas* (c) *averruncesque;*

Mars Pater, I beseech and implore you, that you might be gracious and propitious to me, my house and my household, and on this account I have directed the *suovitaurilia* to be driven around my land, earth and farm; that you might (a) keep away, (b) drive off, and (c) sweep aside (a) sickness, seen and unseen, (b) deprivation and desolation, (c) disaster and extremes of nature.

2)

Benefits

utique tu (d) *fruges, frumenta, vineta virgultaque grandire beneque evenire siris*, (e) *pastores pecuaque salva servassis* (f) *duisque bonam salutem valetudinemque mihi domo familiaeque nostrae*.

and that you might (d) allow crops, grains, vines and bushes to grow large and to bear well, that you might (e) keep safe herders and herds and (f) give well-being and good health to me, my house and my household.

In the first portion of Cato's prayer, writes Benveniste: "Each class is defined by the particular woe that threatens its representatives. The totality of evil is socialized and decomposed into symbolic species"; Benveniste summarizes this triplicate symbolic expression of woe, together with the verbs governing these nominal expressions, as follows:[36]

morbos visos invisosque, visible or hidden maladies, are matters for the science of the priest-magician. The god is asked to 'prohibit' (*prohibessis*) them, and the verb used is one frequently employed in deprecations: *di prohibeant! Jupiter prohibessit!* etc.

viduertatem vastitudinemque, depopulation and devastation, are ravages caused by war (the old term *viduertas* is properly speaking the act of taking the life of a spouse). Hence the second verb is *defendere*, 'to repulse by force' . . .

calamitates intemperiasque are clearly scourges that damage the harvest and must be 'swept away or 'turned aside' (*averrunces*).

In the ensuing portion of this archaic prayer to Mars, the corresponding benefits are enumerated (in reverse order, relative to

that of the listing of woes); rehearsing the operative phrases, Benveniste writes:[37]

> *utique tu fruges, frumenta, vineta virgultaque grandire beneque evenire siris* ['that you might allow crops, grains, vines and bushes to grow large and to bear well'] . . . herald the health of the crop; . . . *pastores pecuaque salva servassis* ['that you might keep safe herders and herds'], that is, in second place as in the Umbrian prayer and with the same expression (see §1.4.2.1.4), the class of 'men', in this case husbandmen; . . . *duisque bonam salutem valetudinemque mihi domo familiaeque nostrae* ['and give well-being and good health to me, my house and my household'], the last class, that of priests, is represented by the person making the offering, . . . and the favor that he is asking is expressed in a *bona salus* formula, both terms of which are equally pregnant with religious value . . . .

1.4.2.1.1 La Première Fonction/La Classe des Prêtres.

The "science of the priest-magician" (Benveniste's characterization of what Dumézil terms *la première fonction*[38]) finds reflection in the operative terms of lines 749–762 of Ovid's prayer to Pales:[39]

Sive sacro pavi, sedive sub arbore sacra,
Pabulaque e bustis inscia carpsit ovis;
Si nemus intravi vetitum, nostrisve fugatae
Sunt oculis nymphae semicaperque deus;
Si mea falx ramo lucum spoliavit opaco,
Unde data est aegrae fiscina frondis ovi,

Da veniam culpae: nec, dum degrandinat, obsit
Agresti fano subposuisse pecus.
Nec noceat turbasse lacus: ignoscite, nymphae,
Mota quod obscuras ungula fecit aquas.
Tu, dea, pro nobis fontes fontanaque placa
Numina, tu sparsos per nemus omne deos.
Nec dryades nec nos videamus labra Dianae
nec Faunum, medio cum permit arva die.
If I used sacred pasture, sat by sacred tree,
And my ignorant sheep browsed on graves;
If I entered a forbidden wood, and the nymphs
And half-goat god bolted from my sight;
If my knife has robbed a grove of a shady bough
To give ailing sheep a basket of leaves:
Forgive my offence. Do not fault me for sheltering

My flock from the hail in a rustic shrine,
Nor harm me for disturbing the pools. Pardon, nymphs,
Trampling hooves for muddying your stream.
You, goddess, placate for us the springs and fountain
Spirits; you [placate] the gods scattered through every grove.
Keep from our sight the Dryads and Diana's bath
And Faunus lying in the fields at noon.

This entire section of the prayer treats violations of the sacred (specifically, sacred spaces) – both *known* and *unknown*, much as in Cato's prayer the symbolization of the sphere of the priest-magician entails the keeping away of both *seen* and *unseen* sickness. And here, as there, the class of the priests is again "represented by the person making the offering": the herder-sacrificer seeks to placate the goddess Pales – and no less the nymphs whose streams his herds may have fouled – and more than that, invokes Pales to placate other deities that he, the sacrificer, may have offended.

1.4.2.1.2 La Troisième Fonction/La Classe des Cultivateurs.

The essential purview of the "third estate"[40] (*la troisième fonction*) lies at the heart of lines 763–774: provision of health, restorative waters, fecundity, and wealth – all elements widely attested in conjunction with the third stratum, the realm of the pastoralist-cultivator in primitive Indo-European social ideology:[41]

Pelle procul morbos; valeant hominesque gregesque,
Et valeant vigiles, provida turba, canes.
Neve minus multos redigam quam mane fuerunt,
Neve gemam referens vellera rapta lupo.
Absit iniqua fames: herbae frondesque supersint,
Quaeque lavent artus quaeque bibantur aquae.
Ubera plena premam, referat mihi caseus aera,
Dentque viam liquido vimina rara sero;
Sitque salax aries, conceptaque semina coniunx
Reddat, et in stabulo multa sit agna meo;
Lanaque proveniat nullas laesura puellas,
Mollis et ad teneras quamlibet apta manus.
Drive diseases away. Health to men and to herds,
Health to the guard dogs, that vigilant pack!
May I never drive home less than the morning's count,
Or groan at wolf-torn fleeces in my hands.

Banish hateful hunger. May grass and leaves abound,
Water to wash the body and to drink.
May I milk full udders, my cheeses make money,
My wicker sieves pass the watery whey.
May the ram be lustful, his pregnant mate return
The seed, and lambs aplenty fill my pens.
May wool be produced unabrasive to girls,
Soft and fit for the most dainty hands.

1.4.2.1.3 La Deuxième Fonction/La Classe des Guerriers.

If in this prayer directed toward a deity of fertility, *effugiat stabulis noxa repulsa meis* 'drive away all harm from my stables – let it flee away' (line 748) affords a somewhat diminished definition of the "class" of physical force (*la deuxième fonction*), in comparison with expressions of the other two-thirds of the societal totality of primitive Indo-European ideology, it is an expression that directly mirrors the corresponding element (underlined in the following) in the Indo-Iranian prayers that Benveniste invokes (a Sanskrit prayer directed to Agni[42] and an Old Persian prayer to Ahuramazda respectively) in identifying the formulaic equivalent in the prayerful lines of Cato's *De agricultura:*[43]

> In *Taitt. Samh.*[44] I, 1, 13, 3, we read: *pāhí prásityai pāhí dúristyai pāhí duradmanyaí*, "keep [me] from subjection! keep [me] from wicked offering! keep [me] from bad food!" Darius echoes this when he implores Ahuramazda's protection for his country (inscr. of Persepolis, *d* §3): *imām dahyāum ahuramazdā pātuv hačā haināyā hačā dušiyārā hačā draugā*, "may Ahuramazda keep this country from the armed enemy, bad harvest, the spirit of falseness."

Moreover, Ovid's prayer compares favorably with these Indo-Iranian homologues in giving priority of place to the invocation of physical power: in each of the three – Latin, Sanskrit, Old Persian – the relevant phrase of force is enunciated in first position (*Fasti* 4.748), prior to those attuned to the two remaining "classes" (priest-magician [4.749–762] and pastoralist-cultivator [4.763–774]). In Cato's prayer as analyzed by Benveniste, in contrast, the comparable prayerful references to the realm of physical force occur in second position in both the first portion of the prayer (enumeration of threatening woes) and in the second (enumeration of benefits).

1.4.2.1.4 An Indo-European Formula of Prayer.

In the prayer to Pales rehearsed by Ovid, this invocation of the element of physical force (line 748) provides the pentameter of the opening couplet of the prayer. The first line of the couplet (line 747), a broad initiatory entreaty to Pales, is itself of considerable interest and significance from a comparative Indo-European perspective:[45]

> *'Consule' dic 'pecori pariter pecorisque magistris*: 747
> *Effugiat stabulis noxa repulsa meis*. 748
> . . . .'
> Say: 'Be propitious to livestock and to masters of livestock the same: 747
> Drive away all harm from my stables – let it flee away' 748
> . . . .'

The worshipful adjuration of line 747 echoes a familiar formula.

Following upon initial observations made by, *inter alia*, Christian Bartholomae in 1904 (columns 1453–1454 of his *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*) and Jacob Wackernagel in 1910,[46] Benveniste identified an Indo-European formula of prayer that preserves reflexes in Italic and Indo-Iranian.[47] Beside Cato's *pastores pecuaque salva servassis* 'that you might keep safe herders and herds' (*Agr*. 141), addressed to Mars in the previously discussed prayer, the Iguvine Tablets (records of the priests of Iguvium called the *Frater Atiieřiur* [the Atiedian Brotherhood]) attest the Umbrian equivalent *viro pequo . . . salva seritu*. These ritual documents from Iguvium preserve the line as a part of a triple invocation that occurs a total of eleven times throughout the tablets: *nerf arsmo, v(e)iro pequo, castruo fri(f)* 'civil authorities [and] priestly authorities, men [and] livestock, heads (of grain)[48] and fruits'; the verb that governs the phrase is either *salva seritu* 'keep safe' (matching Cato's prayer) or *pihatu* 'purify'. Six times the invocation is addressed to the Umbrian deity Jupiter Grabovius; once to Fisovius Sancius; twice to Tefer Jovius; and twice to Prestota Çerfia of Çerfus Martius. The documents attesting the invocation and the permutations of deities invoked and governing verbs used can be summarized as follows:

Tablet		Deity	Verb
VIa	30	Jupiter Grabovius	*pihatu*
	32	Jupiter Grabovius	*salva seritu*
	39–40	Jupiter Grabovius	*pihatu*
	42	Jupiter Grabovius	*salva seritu*
	49–50	Jupiter Grabovius	*pihatu*
	52	Jupiter Grabovius	*salva seritu*
VIb	13	Fisovius Sancius	*salva seritu*
VIb	32	Tefer Jovius	*pihatu*
	34	Tefer Jovius	*salva seritu*
VIIa	17	Prestota Çerfia of Çerfus Martius	*salva seritu*
	30–31	Prestota Çerfia of Çerfus Martius	*salva seritu*

At *Metamorphoses* 1.285–287, in his account of the primeval flood, Ovid makes use of a variant of the Latin nominal phrasing, employing the concatenation *pecudesque virosque* 'both livestock and men' (beside Cato's *pastores pecuaque* 'herders and herds'):[49]

> *exspatiata ruunt per apertos flumina campos*
> *cumque satis arbusta simul pecudesque virosque*
> *tectaque cumque suis rapiunt penetralia sacris*.
> The spreading flood rushes through the open fields
> And sweeps trees and vines away, both livestock and men
> and their thatch, and shrines with sacred things as well.

Indo-Iranian preserves comparable evidence. An Iranian homologue of this Ovidian variant (i.e., of *pecudesque virosque*) and the Italic ritual concatenations – Cato's *pastores pecuaque* and Umbrian *viro pequo* – is provided by a recurring nominal formula of the *Avesta*: Gathic Avestan *pasu-vīra-*; Young Avestan *pasu vīra*.[50] Ancestral to these forms, Umbrian and Iranian, is a reconstructable primitive Indo-European concatenation: *wih$_x$ro- pe̯ku-. Cato's wording (*pastores pecuaque*) is consistent with the reconstructed formula, only showing an alliterative lexical replacement (*pastores*) of inherited *wih$_x$ro-.

Beyond the nominal equations, Watkins has noted that the Italic prayers of Cato and of the Atiedian priests (respectively) –

> *pastores pecuaque salva servassis* 'that you might keep safe herders and herds' *viro pequo . . . salva seritu/pihatu* 'keep safe/purify men [and] livestock'

– are reflexes of a primitive Indo-European sentential formula of prayer that survives equally in the *Avesta*, where the governing verb ϑrā- 'protect' occurs, as in *Yašt* 13.10:[51]

> ϑrāϑrāi pasuuå vīraiiå
> for the protection of livestock [and] men

In addition to the Iranian cases, Watkins[52] adduces Vedic examples in which the word for 'man' (**wih$_x$ro-*) in the inherited formula has been alliteratively replaced by Sanskrit *puruṣa-*, which modification he likens to the Latin alliterative replacement of **wih$_x$ro-* in the inherited formula by *pastores* in Cato's prayer to Mars (*pastores pecuaque*).[53] This Vedic formula can be seen in, for example, *Atharva Veda* 3.28.5 and 6, a pair of lines from a hymn that "is a charm to change the ill-omened birth of twin calves into a blessing."[54] Regarding the portent of the doubly birthing cow, the unnaturally fecund menace that poses a threat to the well-being of other creatures, it is prayed:

> *sā no mā hiṃsīt puruṣān paśūṃś ca*
> Let her not injure our men and livestock

While *trā-*, the Sanskrit cognate of Avestan ϑrā- 'protect', can be used to govern the nominal formula (as in *Atharva Veda* 8.7.11), in the instance just mentioned the governing verbal notion is expressed negatively (*mā hiṃsīt*) using the verb *hiṅs-* 'to injure, wound, destroy'. The formulaic variation is noteworthy: 'not to harm' does not equate to 'to protect'. The maleficent cow is not being entreated, in the third person, 'to protect' men and cattle: the positive equivalent of 'not to protect' is 'to neglect, expose, abandon', rather than 'to harm'. The entreaty is for the cow to cease from being what she is existentially – maleficence – and to let the opposite of what she is be realized: the aim of the worshipper is to render the cow *beneficent* rather than maleficent. This is made quite clear in preceding stanzas of the hymn in which the cow is addressed in the second person and entreated (stanza 3) to be propitious to men (*puruṣa-*), to horses and cows, and to the field (*kṣetra-*); (stanza 4) to bring prosperity to the livestock.

What is clear is that the inherited Indo-European prayer formula for "livestock and men" that we have before us is one in which the governing verbal component shows a degree of semantic variation within the domain of benefaction. In the Umbrian ritual documents from Iguvium, there is clearly a certain regular liturgical alternation between *pihatu* 'purify' and *salva seritu* 'keep safe'. In these, the surviving records of the Atiedian priests, the alternation is attested when the prayer is addressed to Jupiter Grabovius and Tefer Jovius –

the former being equivalent to Roman Jupiter in a triad of Umbrian deities corresponding to the Pre-Capitoline set of Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, and the latter attesting an affiliation to Jupiter by the qualifying epithet, *Jovius*.

In contrast, when the formula is addressed to Fisovius Sancius and to Prestota Çerfia of Çerfus Martius, only the governing verbal construction *salva seritu* 'keep safe' is attested. Fisovius Sancius is perhaps the same god as Fisus Sancius, though the former has a name that is clearly related to the latter as a derivative formation: the theonym *Fisus Sancius* shows a prima facie affiliation to that of the Sabine god *Semo Sancus*, the more so in that Semo Sancus is at times identified by the quadrinomial *Semo Sancus Dius Fidius*;[55] given the similarity (and the etymological derivation of *Fidius* from Latin *fides* 'good faith'), Poultney identifies the Umbrian Fisus Sancius as "a protector of oaths and solemn pledges."[56]

Prestota Çerfia of Çerfus Martius is a goddess affiliated by her naming with the chthonic god Çerfus Martius, who is himself similarly affiliated with Umbrian Mars.[57] With Umbrian *Çerfus*, compare Latin *Cerus*, the name of a god who is addressed in the *Carmina Saliaria* (archaic songs of Mars' priests, the Salii) and who, in some sense, provides a masculine counterpart to the grain goddess Ceres.[58]

In the case of at least the second of these Umbrian deities, Prestota Çerfia of Çerfus Martius, the choice of the formula used – *viro pequo . . . salva seritu* 'keep safe men [and] livestock' (VIIa 17, 30–31) – may well be determined by the local context of its use. It occurs once within a rite of invoking Prestota Çerfia of Çerfus Martius to curse the enemies of Iguvium as libations are poured from black vessels into a trench (VIIa 8–13); the cursing proper is followed immediately and contrastively by entreating the deity for propitiousness to and protection of (*salva seritu* 'keep safe') Iguvium (13–24). The formula occurs a second time in the ensuing rite, which entails pouring libations from white vessels into a trench for the goddess and imploring her to turn evil way from Iguvium and to keep safe (*salva seritu*) the *populus*, the state, and so on (24–36). This rite is then followed, perhaps significantly for the particular verbal variant of the Indo-European formula employed, by offerings and prayers to Fisovius Sancius (36–40): although the formula *viro pequo . . . salva seritu* 'keep safe men [and] livestock' does not occur in this ritual for Fisovius Sancius, the form of the ritual is essentially the same as that of VIb 5–18[59] (a sacrifice of three pigs to Fisus Sancius and subsequent offerings to Fisovius Sancius behind the Tesenacan Gate) in which the formula does occur (line 13); and in the present text (VIIa 36–40), the liturgical instruction is for the same formulae to be used as in VIb 5–

18 (*suront naratu puse post verir tesonocir* [‘he will enunciate the same as behind the Tesenacan Gate’]).

*1.4.2.1.5 The Semantics of *wih$_x$ro- pe$\check{k}$u-.*

By careful lexical analysis of Indo-Iranian, Italic, and Germanic evidence, Benveniste argued cogently that the primitive Indo-European *pe$\check{k}$u- denotes ‘possession mobilière personnelle’.[60] Regarding this “moveable personal possession,” he continues:[61]

> That this possession may in fact take the form of livestock is a separate datum, which concerns social structure and the forms of production. It is only in virtue of this frequent association between the term *pe$\check{k}$u- and the material reality of animal husbandry that, by generalization which took place outside the class of producers, *pe$\check{k}$u- came to mean ‘livestock’ (the first specialization), and specifically ‘small livestock’ (the second specialization), and finally ‘sheep’ (the third and last specialization). But intrinsically *pe$\check{k}$u- does not designate either the flock or any animal species.

More than this – in the primitive formula *wih$_x$ro- pe$\check{k}$u-, *wih$_x$ro- likewise denotes ‘property’, that is – ‘slaves’. Sanskrit *paśu* (from *pe$\check{k}$u-) can of itself denote both quadrupeds – domesticated animals – and bipeds – humans; and when *vīra* is used in conjunction with reference to livestock it means ‘slave’.[62] Benveniste endorses the same value for the Iranian case (“Ce sens . . . vaut aussi pour le *vīra* avestique dans *pasu vīra*.”[63]), citing Gershevitch[64] and adding additional evidence, and he notes that Sittig[65] demonstrates the same for Italic.[66] Taking note of this (i.e., that “‘Men’ as a form of moveable wealth in all these traditions means ‘slaves’”[67]), Watkins adds:[68]

> Whence Greek ἀνδραπόδεσσι (Homer +) ‘slaves’ ‘2-footed chattels’ beside Mycenean *qetoropopi* [k^{w}etropopphi] ‘4-footed chattels’. Note also Vergil *Georgics* 1.118 *hominumque boumque labores* ‘the toil of men and oxen’, as pointed out to me by Richard Thomas.

In regard to Benveniste’s observations on the semantics of concatenated *wih$_x$ro- pe$\check{k}$u-, the variant of the primitive Indo-European formula with which Ovid begins his rehearsed prayer to Pales (*Fasti* 4. 747) is particularly noteworthy. The inherited form *wih$_x$ro- ‘man’ again – as in Sanskrit *puruṣān paśuṃś ca* ‘men and livestock’ and Cato’s *pastores pecuaque* ‘herders and herds’ – finds an alliterative lexical replacement, *pecoris magistris*, with the insertion of

an adverb, *pariter*, intensifying the alliteration: *consule . . . pecori pariter pecorisque magistris* 'be propitious . . . to herds and to masters of herds the same'. What exactly is a *pecoris magister*? To answer that question, let us first consider more broadly the early use of Latin *magister*.

The nominal *magister*, from Proto-Indo-European *meǧ- 'great', is a primitive term, as revealed by its fundamental residence in the legal and religious lexicon of Latin:[69]

> Le mot, dont le sens général est « maître, chef », appartient d'abord à la langue du droit et de la religion : *m. sacrorum*, *m. Arualium*, etc., et a pris toute sorte d'acceptions suivant les catégories auxquelles il s'appliquait, armée, marine, magistratures civiles, école, vie privée, etc.

Varro (*Ling.* 5.82) tells us that Latin *magister populi* 'master of the *populus*' is another term for *dictator*, since *est summa populi dictator* 'the *dictator* holds the highest power over the *populus*'.[70] It is an old name for the office, its anteriority reflected in its continued use in religious and legal texts (see Cicero *De republica* 1.63; *De legibus* 3.9*;* see also *De finibus* 3.75). Seneca (*Epistulae* 108.31) makes it explicit, commenting on *dictator*: *apud antiquos magistrum populi vocatum* 'called the *magister populi* in ancient days'; Seneca continues regarding this alternative term for *dictator*:

> *Hodieque id extat in auguralibus libris, et testimonium est, quod qui ab illo nominatur, magister equitum est*.
>
> And today it occurs in the augural books, and witness [of its antiquity] is provided by the fact that the one who is named as [the *dictator*'s] subordinate is the *magister equitum*.

This *magister equitum* 'master of the horsemen',[71] the subordinate of the *magister populi*, is so called, explains Varro (if providing less illumination than one would wish[72]), *quod summa potestas huius in equites et accensos* 'since his is the highest power over the *equites* and the supernumeraries'.

The *magister populi* and *magister equitum* thus both exert authority over some appreciable element of Roman society – *populus* and horsemen, respectively. The nature of that authority certainly evolved over time in Rome. Consider, for example, the intriguing hypothesis advanced by Cornell that Roman kingship dissolved in the later sixth century into the dual offices of the (1) *rex sacrorum*, and of (2) a

magister populi, who was appointed for life (rather than for a *dictator*'s typical maximum six-month term of service):[73]

> The *rex sacrorum* would be the old king reduced to a minor ceremonial role involving sacrificial duties and supervision of the calendar. Meanwhile the tyrant (or *magister populi*) took over politically important religious functions such as the conduct of the auspices and the dedication of sanctuaries.

Among supporting evidence that Cornell rehearses is that provided by the tradition of dual sovereigns in Alba Longa – a tradition perhaps to be linked with the presence of both a *dictator* and a *rex sacrorum* in that parent city of Rome at the time it was destroyed, as well as in Lanuvium:[74]

> These parallel instances make it possible (though they do not necessarily make it probable) that in the later sixth century Rome went thorough a 'proto-republican' stage, under a life magistrate (*magister populi*) who ruled alongside the king reduced *ad sacra*. This suggestion is no more than a hypothesis, and cannot be verified in the present state of our knowledge, but it provides the best explanation of that lonely and mysterious figure the *rex sacrorum*.

In apparent stark contrast to both the *magister populi* and the *magister equitum*,[75] a *magister pecoris* – when the name is taken at face value – is no master of a body of persons – not of the collective *populus*, not of some set of *equites*,[76] not of any human contingent. He is master (*magister*) only of a body of domesticated animals – of a herd, of a flock – of livestock (*pecus*). The expression is "normal in prose for *pastor* ['shepherd']" we read[77] – but not to the exclusion of verse: Virgil uses the phrase in the plural to denote 'shepherds' in his depiction of a bucolic holiday in *Georgics* 2 (see lines 529–530), and more generically in the singular at *Eclogues* 3.101; *magistri* without genitival modification (i.e., *pecoris*) is similarly used of 'shepherds' at *Georgics* 3.445 (though *pecus* 'flock' appears as the object of the verb *perfundere* 'to bathe' of which *magistri* is subject – in effect a stylistic, syntactic alteration of the phrase *magister pecoris* [and compare the alternative *pastor* 'shepherd' in line 455]) and also *Eclogues* 2.33 – and of those who handle horses at *Georgics* 3.118 and of cowherds at *Aeneid* 12.717.[78] Elsewhere in the *Fasti* (3.61), Ovid uses the phrase *omnibus agricolis armentorumque magistris* 'to all farmers and masters of

herds' to refer to rustic cohorts of Romulus and Remus; and Livy (1.4.6) identifies Faustulus, the shepherd who discovered the abandoned twin sons of Mars to become their foster father, as *magister regii pecoris* – that is, a shepherd of the royal flock.

There is, however, a quite distinct, technical meaning attached to the phrase *magister pecoris*. It is a term used of a slave who serves as an overseer among shepherds;[79] in other words, *magister pecoris*, in parallel with *magister populi* and *magister equitum*, can indeed denote a "master" of a body of persons.[80] Varro, for example, mentions the title (*magister pecoris*) at *De re rustica* 1.2.14 in tandem with *vilicus*, the term for a person, typically a slave, who runs a farm,[81] as the denotations of those respectively in charge of farm and herd.[82] In the second book of the same work, Varro writes of the qualities desired in slaves who serve as herders,[83] including the supervisory *magister pecoris* (2.10); compare Columella *De re rustica* 7.6.9.

The social status of the *magister pecoris* in the first century, unlike that of shepherds in general, seems to have been consistently marked. Suetonius (*Divus Iulius* 42.1) records that Julius Caesar had enacted various reform measures to stem the shrinking of Rome's population, which included the following:

> *Neve ii, qui pecuarium facerent, minus tertia parte puberum ingenuorum inter pastores haberent*
>
> And those engaged in the production of flocks were to have no fewer than a third of freeborn men among their shepherds.

While Roman shepherds in Ovid's time were thus both free and slave by, ideally,[84] no less than about a 1 to 2 ratio, the supervising *magister pecoris* appears to have been, like the managing *vilicus*, typically a slave.[85]

The use of the term *magister pecoris* in Ovid's recorded prayer to Pales (*Consule pecori pariter pecorisque magistris*; *Fasti* 4.747) thus lends an unmistakably primitive flavor to that enunciation. Whether by the design of the exiled poet or otherwise, the lexical choice synchronically encodes and continues the diachronic Indo-European notion that the human half of the ancestral concatenated formula of prayer, *wih$_x$ro- pe̯ku-, refers to property no less than the livestock half. Cato's comparable *pastores pecuaque* (*De agricultura* 141) would have constituted a (legally) more ambiguous statement with regard to the worshipful Roman shepherds – that is, with regard to the Roman *populus* (*Fasti* 4.731) that has gathered on April 21 (the foundation day of Rome) to celebrate the rites of Pales – whom Ovid directs (*dic*)

to utter his recorded prayer (4.747). Synchronically, Ovid's variant of the *Metamorphoses* (1.286), *pecudesque virosque*, while continuing the primitive Indo-European lexical expression of the human element, would be equally semantically inefficient, if for different reasons.

1.4.2.1.6 The Rites of the Parilia.

In addition to preserving the archaic prayer to be uttered to Pales (*Fasti* 4.747–776), Ovid describes the celebratory rites, providing first a ritual preview in a proem as the poet seeks the goddess's favor (4.723–728):[86]

Alma Pales, faveas pastoria sacra canenti,
Prosequor officio si tua festa meo.
Certe ego de vitulo cinerem stipulasque fabales
Saepe tuli plena, februa tosta, manu;
Certe ego transilui positas ter in ordine flammas,
Udaque roratas laurea misit aquas.
Gentle Pales, favour my song of pastoral rites,
If I honour your deeds with my service.
Truly I have often brought handfuls of calf ash
And bean stalks burned for purification.
Truly I have jumped the triple row of flames
And felt sodden laurel's dripping water.

In lines following (4.731–746, 777–804), Ovid goes on to touch upon these cultic elements in somewhat more detail, and to speculate on their aetiology.

In *Fasti* 4:731–734, the poet tells where the *populus Romanus* is to obtain the fumigant (*suffimen*) for the Parilia – from the Vestal Virgins (lines 731–732)[87] –

I, pete virginea, populus, suffimen ab ara;
Vesta dabit, Vestae munere purus eris.

Go, *populus*, seek fumigant from the virginal altar;
Vesta will give it, Vesta's gift will cleanse.

– and more fully enumerates, the constituents of the requisite fumigant (lines 733–734) – a triple mélange made not only of calf ash and empty beanstalks (as in lines 725–726) but of horse blood as well. The calf ash is that produced six days prior to the Parilia (i.e., on April 15) by the burning of fetal calves at the celebration of the rites of the Fordicidia, when pregnant cows were slaughtered for the earth

goddess Tellus (see Ovid, *Fasti* 4.629–672) – rites with Vedic parallels.[88] Some have claimed the horse-blood ingredient to be a remnant of those drops shaken from the severed tail of the Equus October onto the hearth of the *rex* (on October 15; see §8.7.2.4.1), though the evidence is not good and the scenario a *prima facie* improbable one, as Dumézil saw.[89] Dried-up, empty beanstalks would have been easily enough saved from some preceding harvest, the bean, *faba*, being planted at multiple times during the year (see Pliny *Historia Naturalis* 18.120; Columella *Rust.* 2.10.8–10; Virgil *G.* 1.215).

It requires little ingenuity to see the significance of the fumigant's triple constituency when examined in the context of the primitive elements of Indo-European ideology preserved in the accompanying prayer to Pales. Calf ash is the product of an operation of the "science of the priest-magician" (*la première fonction*): on April 15, Pontifices, practitioners of that science, sacrifice pregnant cows across Rome, sacerdotal attendants (*ministri*) remove their unborn calves, and the senior Vestal ritually incinerates these fetuses of Earth's bovine victims. Ovid describes the scene in the opening lines of his *Fasti* entry for the day with its celebration of the Fordicidia (4.629–640):[90]

Tertia post Veneris cum lux surrexerit Idus,
Pontifices, forda sacra litate bove.
Forda ferens bos est fecundaque dicta ferendo:
Hinc etiam fetus nomen habere putant.
Nunc gravidum pecus est, gravidae quoque semine terrae:
Telluri plenae victima plena datur.
Pars cadit arce Iovis, ter denas curia vaccas
Accipit et largo sparsa cruore madet.

Ast ubi visceribus vitulos rapuere ministri,
Sectaque fumosis exta dedere focis,
Igne cremat vitulos quae natu maxima Virgo est,
Luce Palis populos purget ut ille cinis.

When the third day dawns after the Ides of Venus,
Pontiffs, prepare to sacrifice a brood cow.
A 'brood' cow is in calf and is called 'bounteous'
From 'bearing'. 'Birthing', too, they think is from this.
The herd is now pregnant, seed impregnates the earth;
Teeming Tellus gets a teeming victim.
Cows crumple on Jupiter's height; all thirty wards
Accept a cow, and drip with spattered blood.
When the acolytes have ripped the calves from the wombs
And dropped the sliced guts on the smoking hearths,
The eldest Virgin cremates the calves in the fire

To cleanse the *populus* with this ash on Pales' day. 640

Horse blood, the second ingredient, is the vital fluid of that animal that is the special prerogative of the practitioners of physical force (*la deuxième fonction*). The horse is an animal off-limits to the Flamen Dialis (Aulus Gellius *Noctes Atticae* 10.15.3–4; Plutarch *Quaestiones Romanae* 40; Pliny *HN* 28.146), the priest of Jupiter, god representing *la première fonction* in the archaic Pre-Capitoline triad. But it appears not to be off limits, and reasonably so, to the Flamen of Mars,[91] god of *la deuxième fonction* in that primitive Italic assemblage of three deities, god who receives the sacrifice of a horse on the Ides of October (the Equus October; see §8.7.2.4.1). It is a constituent of Pales's fumigant that is drawn from the realm of – to exercise Benveniste's terminology – *la classe des guerriers*.

The bean, *faba*, is a staple of the diet of the Roman *populus* – a main course in a veritable divine feast for the rustic, writes Horace at *Satires* 2.6.63–64, depicting a longing for a meal of *faba* accompanied by greens and bacon. *Faba* could also be ground into a meal (*lomentum*) and used to make bread – in fact, observes Pliny (*HN* 18.117), *fabae multiplex usus omni quadripedum generi, praecipue homini* 'there are many uses of *faba* for all types of quadrupeds, and especially for humans'. The *siliquae caulesque* 'pods and stalks' of *faba* 'make the very best fodder for livestock' (*gratissimo sunt pabulo pecori*; *HN* 18.120). *Faba* is said to be a natural fertilizer, the green plant being ploughed into the soil in place of manuring the fields (Theophrastus *Historia plantarum* 8.7.2, 9.1; Pliny *HN* 18.120; Varro *Rust.* 23.3–4; cf. Columella *Rust.* 2.10.7). More than that, *faba* is itself a fecund crop, growing back, even as the moon waxes, after being grazed by livestock (Pliny *HN* 18.119).

The affiliations of *faba* with fertility extend far beyond these purely pragmatic agricultural matters, however. Diogenes Laertius (8.34) reports that Aristotle noted the bean's resemblance to genitalia – one cause of Pythagorean abstinence from beans. Lucian (*Vitarum auctio* 6) makes a similar observation, and adds that the bean is generativeness itself (τὸ πᾶν γονή). Invoking "Alexander the Epicurean," Plutarch (*Quaestiones convivales* 2.3.1) gives expression to the latter point, likening beans to eggs in this regard; see also Johannes Lydus, *De mensibus* 4.42 (citing Heraclides Ponticus). Lydus also knows accounts that a wilted bean flower sealed within a vessel will develop into a child's head or into female genitalia, and that beans placed beneath manure will generate men.[92]

Faba is no less associated with sensuality. Plutarch (*Quaest. Rom.* 95) rehearses the notion that beans 'incite the urge to have sex' (πρὸς

συνουσίαν παρορμᾷ). Lydus agrees (*Mens*. 4.42): eating beans διεγείρει τὰ σώματα πρὸς συνουσίαν 'excites people to sexual intercourse'.

The third constituent of the fumigant of the Parilia, *faba*, is unambiguously aligned with *la troisième fonction*. We saw earlier that the ingredient of the fumigant that symbolizes the realm of physical force, horse blood, is a material that is alien to the Flamen Dialis: the priest of Jupiter is not permitted to have contact with the horse. The constituent that embodies the realm of fertility is no less off-limits to that priest. The Flamen Dialis is explicitly prohibited from touching *faba* – even from uttering the word (Aulus Gellius *NA* 10.15.12–13). This dual alienation of the Flamen of *la première fonction* from the materials that align themselves with *la deuxième fonction* and *la troisième fonction* within the ingredient-list of Pales's fumigant, horse blood and *faba*, respectively, can be no coincidence. The *faba* plant, a fundamental foodstuff, lies squarely within the ideological space of the two principal elements of the Indo-European "third estate," the farmer and the pastoralist: *faba* brings fertility to the soil; *faba* provides the best fodder. More generally, the fruit of the plant is fundamentally generative and inspires reproductive activity – the core notion of *Fasti* 4:763–774, the prayerful lines addressed to Pales typifying, à la Benveniste, *la classe des cultivateurs*.[93]

Ovid also describes the preparation of the ritual space and of the smoky cultic flames, and advises Pales's worshipper of her favored offerings. The worshipper is to utter the prescribed prayer four times while facing east, with hands cleansed in dew, and to leap across a triple row of the ritual fires. Propertius (4.4.75–78) and Tibullus (2.5.89–90) likewise make reference to the shepherd leaping over the sacred flames of the Parilia, as does Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom*. 1.88.1) in his account of the events of the day on which Romulus founded Rome; the act is clearly a seminal feature of the Parilia – Ovid devoting twenty-four lines to speculating on the origin of this fire-leaping (*Fasti* 4. 783–806). Given the marriage of both the prayer and cultic material of the Parilia to the three realms of primitive Indo-European ideology, the presence of a triplicate of sacred fires within the ceremonies of the day takes on significance – more especially so given the apparent great antiquity of the rite as suggested by apparent cognate traditions practiced among Celts, close relatives, culturally and linguistically, of the Italic peoples.

In his commentary on Ovid's *Fasti*, Frazer draws particular attention to unmistakable similarities between elements of Rome's Parilia and the more recently attested celebrations of Celtic Beltane.[94] Most significant of these is the presence of the flame of triplicity over which celebrants leap – a parallel that Frazer credits Mannhardt with having

earlier observed.[95] Frazer elaborates:[96]

> He points out rightly that at the Beltane fires, formerly kindled in the Highlands of Scotland on May Day (only ten days later than the Parilia), the person who drew the black lot (a piece of oatmeal cake blackened with charcoal) had to leap thrice through the flames for the sake of "rendering the year productive of the sustenance of man and beast."[97] In the north-east of Scotland it was the custom to dance thrice "southwise" round the Beltane fire.[98] In Wales the custom as to the Beltane fires was similar. The person who picked up a piece of brown oatmeal cake had to leap thrice over the flames, or to run thrice between two fires; for in Wales the practice sometimes was to kindle two fires side by side. By leaping thrice over the fire or running thrice between the two fires the people thought that they made sure of a plentiful harvest.[99] The Beltane festival on May Day seems to have been essentially, like the Parilia, a herdsman's festival. A writer of the eighteenth century says that in the parish of Logierait (Perthshire) it was chiefly celebrated by cowherds, who assembled by scores in the fields for the purpose.[100]

1.4.2.1.7 Indo-European Antiquity.

Reading the prayer and rites of Pales as preserved by Ovid, goddess served by one of the archaic Flamines (the Flamen Palatualis), we undoubtedly find ourselves in the presence of deeply ancient Indo-European religious tradition. Though not operating within a comparative Indo-European framework per se, Frazer observed the same. Beyond similarities between the Parilia and the May Day festival of Beltane, Frazer noted the practice of similar rites in eastern European celebrations of St. George's Day on April 23 "only two days after the Parilia, with which they may well be connected by descent from a common festival observed by pastoral Aryan peoples in spring."[101] Frazer continues:[102]

> Of these great pastoral rites of ancient Europe, the Parilia, as described above all by Ovid in the present passage, is the first recorded example. The poet was unquestionably right in holding that the festival was older than the foundation of Rome.

1.4.2.2 Palibus II.

This discussion of the Parilia, a Roman ritual rooted in primitive Indo-

European religious theory and practice, began with the observation that the earliest surviving Roman calendar, the *Fasti Antiates maiores*, marks the occurrence of a second rite dedicated to the shepherd's deity (*Palibus II* 'for two Pales') – this one on July 7, coinciding with the celebration of the Nonae Caprotinae – festival affiliated with the Poplifugia of July 5. The plurality of this calendrical reference to the deity – *Palibus II* – is not unique. Heurgon[103] pointed out that all manuscripts of Varro's *De re rustica* 2.5.1 attest the plural *Palibus* – a reading that had been routinely emended by the various editors of the text. The form occurs in a line spoken by the senator Quintus Lucienus, who has arrived late to a gathering for a discussion of animal husbandry; being chastised for his tardiness, he, in a humorous vain, says he will excuse himself from the discussion for a while longer, adding:

> *Tu vero, Murri, veni mi advocatus, dum asses solvo Palibus, si postea a me repetant, ut testimonium perhibere possis*.
>
> But you, Murrius, come and be my helper while I pay two *asses* to the Pales (pl.), so that if later they demand them from me, you can step up as my witness.

Atticus, another of the participants in the dialogue, then says to this Murrius (2.5.2):

> *Narra isti, inquit, eadem, qui sermones sint habiti et quid reliqui sit, ut ad partes paratus veniat; nos interea secundum actum de maioribus adtexamus*.
>
> Tell him [i.e. Lucienus], he said, as you go what words have been spoken so far and what words remain to be said, so that he may return prepared for his part; and in the meantime, let us add on the second act – concerning the larger animals.

Lucienus does not know what had been discussed prior to his arrival and what has not – and it falls to Murrius to fill him in on the discussion of the "first act," which Varro has neatly marked as completed by the late arrival of Lucienus.

Dumézil argues that the positioning of the line within the dialogue of the passage – exactly between treatment of the smaller and larger animals – reveals that Lucienus's reference at this juncture to the plural *Palibus* – to whom he must surrender coin for the tardiness that caused him to miss the discussion of smaller livestock, and his consequent absence from a part of the discussion of the larger – is a

reference to two Pales, one of smaller and one of larger livestock:[104]

> This interpretation is confirmed by the plan of the third book of the *Georgics*, which is devoted to animal husbandry. It is divided into two strictly equal parts, one devoted to the large and the other to the small animals. At the beginning of each section the poet invokes Pales (1 and 289), whereas in the book devoted to the labors of the fields, Ceres is mentioned only once, at the beginning, as is Bacchus in the book which deals with gardens and the vineyard. This interpretation is based on the duality of the festivals, on 21 April and on 7 July.

These two dates, continues Dumézil, following Columella, reflect the two mating periods for smaller and larger livestock. Columella (*Rust.* 7.3.11) writes that the first season for mating ewes is in the spring at the time of the Parilia, unless the animal has previously given birth, in which case it should be bred *circa Iulium mensem* 'in about the month of July'. In the case of cows, however, breeding typically occurs in July, which is the time when cows are naturally prone to intercourse, writes Columella (6.24.1–2). Dumézil concludes:[105]

> The rites follow these expediencies. In those of 21 April, when only sheep are involved, a single Pales is concerned [i.e. the Pales of smaller livestock]; on the Nones of July, when other sheep, but especially the cows, are to be serviced, one addresses oneself *Palibus II* [i.e. to the Pales of smaller livestock and to the Pales of larger].

Dumézil offers a compelling analysis. But whatever signification one may attribute to the notation *Palibus II* in the *Fasti Antiates maiores*, it is remarkable that Romulaean aetiologies are attached to both of the days on which Pales is celebrated. As we have already noted, Romulus's foundation of Rome, his ploughing of the Palatine *pomerium*, that sacred urban boundary (on which see §4.3.2.1), is assigned to the day of the Parilia (April 21). And as we shall see in Chapter 2, Romulus's departure from Rome, his disappearance from within the extra-*pomerial* space of the Campus Martius, is assigned to the time of the ritual complex of the Poplifugia/Nonae Caprotinae (July 5/7), and the latter day is that of *Palibus II*. April 21, day of the vernal *Parilia*, is also the birthday of Numa Pompilius, the successor to Romulus on the throne of Rome; but it is the traumatic disappearance of Romulus at the time of the second celebration of Pales that will in fact bring Numa to that throne. This remarkable set of

correspondences can be summarized as follows:

Parilia: Celebration of Pales

1) Romulus founds Rome
2) Romulus ploughs the *pomerium* encapsulating sacred urban space
3) Numa Pompilius is born

Nonae Caprotinae: Celebration of *Palibus II*

1) Romulus disappears from Rome
2) Romulus disappears from a space lying outside of the *pomerium*
3) Romulus's disappearance brings Numa to the throne

1.5 Some Conclusions

In the heat of Roman high summer, on a festival day that falls uniquely within the calendar between the Kalends and the Nones, the *populus* of Rome marks a flight from the city, a flight that in the aetiology of the festival is consequent to a crisis in the domain of the Roman warrior. This is the Poplifugia of July 5. Tightly bound to this 'flight of the *populus*', calendrically, aetiologically, and thematically, are the Nonae Caprotinae – celebration of the Nones of July (i.e., July 7). The event is again consequent to Roman warrior-crisis, but a crisis from which delivery is engineered by a clever slave-woman and her followers, who render helpless an invading warrior host by applications of sex and wine that leave the enemy defenseless and thus effect a resolution of the Roman warrior-crisis. In keeping with this aetiology, the annual rites of that day, the 'Goat Nones', are replete with symbols of fertility and sexuality, ranging from slave-women promenading while engaging in salacious banter with the men whom they meet – to women, free and slave, offering the milky sap of the wild fig tree (*caprificus*) to the goddess Juno, who is styled *Caprotina*. The offering is made beneath such a 'goat fig' and the women feast beneath boughs of the same. These rites are celebrated in the vicinity of the 'Goat's Marsh' (Caprae Palus), itself lying within the great warrior space of the Campus Martius. Consus, deity of stored grain, is likewise celebrated on this day (within the space of the chariot arena, the Circus Maximus) as is Pales, ancient deity, promoting fertility of domesticated animals.

The fecund element of society flourishes and thrives at the moment of the crisis of the warrior. A certain dependency of the realm of

physical power upon the realm of fertility is demonstrated; the latter overshadows the former. This state of affairs is underscored by the coupling of the rituals of Pales to the mythic-historic accounts of Rome's founding warrior-king, Romulus. That day on which Romulus's founding of the city and his ploughing of the Palatine *pomerium* receive their annual memorialization is the day of the great springtime celebration of the deity who imbues herd and flock with fertility and brings cow and ewe successfully through pregnancy – Pales, goddess served by one of the archaic priests, the Flamines, invoked with forms and formulae of Indo-European antiquity, worshipped with rites that no less than her prayer preserve archaic Indo-European ideology. The traumatic day on which Romulus is snatched away from the *populus Romanus* – equally a crisis of the warrior realm – is that of the summer celebration of that same goddess of fecundity, protectress of parturient livestock, large and small.

[1] That is, the primitive (Romulaean) calendar of Rome, said to have been expanded to twelve months by Numa Pompilius. See Boyle and Woodard 2004 *passim*.

[2] Dumézil 1980:242; reprint and translation of Dumézil 1975:272:

Quant aux Poplifugia, ils ne sont pour nous qu'un nom, remarquable en ce que, à la différence du singulier *regifugium*, il a une forme plurielle. Cette fête est aussi la seule de l'année à être placée dans la partie de mois qui précède les Nones. Le première fait engage à comprendre *-fugia*, comme le faisaient les anciens, « fuites multiples, désordonnées, dans la confusion » . . . ."

[3] These days, along with the Ides, stand as prominent temporal landmarks in the calendar of each month, the Kalends being the first day of the month, the Nones the seventh day in months of 31 days, otherwise the fifth day, and the Ides the fifteenth day in 31-day months, otherwise the thirteenth day.

[4] A state of affairs long noted by scholars: see, for example, Warde Fowler 1899:174, with reference to still earlier work that is referenced

by WF in note 5 of that work.

[5] On the Regifugium as fundamentally the flight of the Rex Sacrorum, see Woodard 2011 *passim*, but especially pp. 329–332.

[6] The reference is to Varro's *Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum*: "In Varro's work, the *Antiquitates* in particular, which was hailed as a revelation by Cicero, nearly the whole inheritance of Latin civilization was illustrated and given order: the purpose was a systematic review of Roman life in its connections with the past, as evidenced by language, literature, and customs" (Conte 1994:212). On the structure of the work, see §2.4.1.

[7] Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Antiquitates Romanae* 5.60.3–4.

[8] On the Roman conflicts with Fidenae, see Forsythe 2005:241–246. On the site of Fidenae, see Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1986.

[9] Alföldi 1965:132; see his bibliography at note 7. On Ficulea as mentioned by literary sources, see also the summary in Burn 1876:393–394. On the site of Ficulea, see Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1993.

[10] Dumézil 1980:242; reprint and translation of Dumézil 1975:272:

. . . le second [fait] engage à voir dans les Poplifugia un prélude à la fête qui les suit immédiatement, les Nonae Caprotinae, elles-mêmes exceptionnelles sinon anormales, puisqu'elles sont dans l'année la seule fête fixée à un jour de Nones.

[11] As Plutarch's account shows, and as we shall see more clearly farther along, the two versions – Latin and Etruscan – are not at all

mutually exclusive. This would be even more so were the tradition altered so as to remove the fourth-century sacking of Rome by the Gauls as a chronological benchmark. The Etruscan city of Veii long influenced Fidenae, which town Mommsen (2006:40 [a reprint of the 1868 English translation of *Römische Geschichte*]) referred to as "the *tête du pont* of the Etruscans on the left bank of the Tiber." According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 2.53.4), Fidenae was founded by the eldest of three brothers from Alba Longa at the same time that the Albans founded Nomentum and Crustumerium. Romulus fought against and defeated the Fidenians, who τρέπονται πρὸς φυγήν 'were put to flight'; pursuing them, Romulus συνεισπίπτει τοῖς φεύγουσιν εἰς τὸ τεῖχος 'rushed into the walls of the city along with those fleeing' (*Ant. Rom.* 2.53.3–4). As a consequence of Romulus's capture of Fidenae, Dionysius reports (*Ant. Rom.* 2.54.3), Etruscan Veii went to war against Rome. Livy, in his account of the episode (1.15.1), writes of the Fidenians being themselves Etruscan. Rome destroyed Veii in 396 BC and enslaved the free members of the populace (Livy 5.22.1; see, *inter alia*, Forsythe 2005:250).

[12] The author is not unaware of criticisms regarding the source. The *Parallela Graeca et Romana* is among modern scholars commonly considered to be not only of spurious authorship but an inferior work, based upon judgments of literary and historical quality and linguistic usages, though the work found staunch and intelligent support in the 1931 dissertation of Schlereth (*De Plutarchii quae feruntur Parallela Minora*) and was accorded a reputable status in earlier periods. Boulogne takes a favorable stance in the 2002 Budé edition, for which he has been robustly criticized. Regarding the *Parallela*, Cameron (2004:128), for example, who espouses a harsh view, writes, "For sheer triviality, gross ignorance, and irresponsible fabrication no other ancient work I can think of (not even the *Historia Augusta*) comes even close to the *Parallela*. Not to mention individual historical blunders, ..." On the other hand, one might see the *Parallela* as a source of unique information and wonder if it may have been too quickly dismissed by many in the last century for the sake of academic conformity or vogue in matters of canonicity. And one is keenly aware that unconventional linguistic usages and reporting do not, in and of themselves, make of an author a fool but quite often reveal simply an idiosyncratic or individualistic cognitive apparatus – or a penchant for linguistic and stylistic deviation (on occasion even judged to be a mark of "literary genius") or for documenting the unusual. I leave aside the matter of source citations in the *Parallela*, numerous of which sources are not otherwise known: one familiar with the vast

quantity of documentary evidence surviving from the ancient Near East would scarcely find it surprising that many authors are hardly known or completely unknown among the relatively meager quantity of literary materials that have survived from Greco-Roman antiquity. In any event, such matters are of little concern in regard to the two *Parallela* examined herein, which are in fundamental agreement with the traditions as otherwise attested – if providing interesting alternative specifics – including traditions attested by non-Classical, cognate Indo-European sources – and, so, reminiscent of linguistic archaisms that often present themselves as the invaluable exceptions.

[13] Τὸ προκάλυμμα is derived from τὸ κάλυμμα (from the root of καλύπτω 'to cover, conceal'), typically denoting a 'veil' or a 'hood', but also, *inter alia*, 'fishing net', and in this sense is used to name the garment with which Clytemnestra snares Agamemnon in his bath (Aeschylus *Choephoroi* 494).

[14] And τὸ παραπέτασμα is derived from τὸ πέτασμα (from the root of the verb πετάννυμι 'to spread out'), denoting 'that which is spread out'. Both words have solid primitive Indo-European pedigrees.

[15] Atepomarus is otherwise attested as a Celtic divine epithet, perhaps meaning 'great horseman': for example, Mercury Atepomarus at Rennes (Woolf 1998:224); Apollo Atepomarus at Mauvières (Green 1992:208).

[16] Liddell and Scott 1996:1618.

[17] And one might wonder if the image of a bearded Cynic may be meant to invoke the goat (Latin *caper* [masculine]; *capra* [feminine]) affiliations of the July Nones (*Nonae Caprotinae*); on which see more later.

[18] And there is no suggestion among the ancient sources that the

fighting is meant to imbue fertility in the way that whipping with strips of goat hide during the Lupercalia was said to have so affected those struck, as some have speculated. Warde Fowler noted as much well over a century ago; referring to Varro's (*Ling.* 6.18) comment that "a rod (*virga*) was also cut from [a *caprificus*]," he remarked (1899:178–179 [with a footnote to Mannhardt 1884]: "[I]t has been ingeniously conjectured that it was with this that the handmaids beat each other, as Plutarch describes, to produce fertility, just as at the Lupercalia the women were beaten with strips cut from the skins of the victims (*amiculum Junonis*). But this is mere conjecture, ... :" On the Lupercalia, see Woodard 2006:86; Boyle and Woodard 2004:191–195.

[19] Plutarch renders the name in Greek as τὸ τῆς αἰγὸς ἕλος. See §10.5.1 for discussion of the site.

[20] Whatmough 1922:190.

[21] Compare Palmer's (1974:14–15) reading *Iuno(ne) Palost(ri)* (i.e., with an epithet *palostris*): "The epithet *palostris* might refer to a site like the Caprae Palus outside Rome," Palmer suggests.

[22] On the goat affiliations of the Lupercalia, see Boyle and Woodard 2004:191–195, and compare note 18.

[23] See Boyle and Woodard 2004:194.

[24] Commentators on these rites have not been slow to invoke, vis-à-vis the element of fertility, the ancient Roman practice of caprification (still in use today): the introduction of a branch from a wild fig into the presence of a domesticated fig for the purpose of fertilization. Frazer (1929:2:344) attributes the suggestion to Preller (1881–83:1:287); Frazer writes: "Palladius [*De re rustica* 4.10.28] recommended the solstice in June, Columella [*De re rustica* 11.2.56]

preferred July for the operation . . . .”

[25] Dumézil 1996:294.

[26] On the “three functions” of Proto-Indo-European society, see, *inter alia*, Dumézil 1930a; 1996:156–161, 246–272; Benveniste 1932a; 1969:1:279–292. For summary of the evidence, see Woodard 2006:11–20. On primitive Indo-European vis-à-vis historical Rome, see Woodard 2006:20–39. And see, especially §§1.4.2.1.1–1.4.2.1.3, for further discussion.

[27] See Boyle and Woodard 2004:210–211, with references.

[28] On Pales, see especially Dumézil 1969:274–287 and 1996:380–385.

[29] There are three ancient authors who identify the gender of Pales as male. Servius (*Georgics* 3.1) attributes the view to Varro (but contrast Varro’s inclusion of the deity in a list of goddesses in his *Manippean Satire* Σκιομαχία, as preserved by Aulus Gellius [*Noctes Atticae* 13.23.4]), and both Arnobius (*Adversus nationes* 3.40) and Martianus Capella (1.50, 51) explicitly state as much. With the discovery of the *Fasti Antiates maiores*, some scholars took its notation of *Palibus II* on July 7 to point to the existence of both a male and a female Pales (see, for example, the comments of Rose 1960:163). Dumézil (1969:275–277; 1996:381) has argued that the evidence properly read reveals that in Roman religious practice, Pales is feminine only, and that the identification of a male god of the same name is merely an artifact of learned discussions invoking an Etruscan god of domesticated animals who was equated with the Roman goddess.

[30] As opposed to the Flamines Maiores, the priests of the three members of the Pre-Capitoline Triad (Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus), on which see §5.3.1.

[31] Frazer (1929:3:338) summarizes in this way: “The day is so marked (*Natalis urbis Romae*) in the calendars of Polemius Silvius and Philocalus; and in the Caeretan calendar under the twenty-first of April there is the note: ‘Rome founded.’”

[32] Fantham 1998:233: “This is the only prayer in book IV which O[vid] dictates rather than reports. And to whom? To the (Roman) shepherd people named in 731.” The referred-to line is *I, pete virginea, populus, suffimen ab ara* ‘Go, *populus*, seek fumigant from the virginal altar’ (the translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:105, with modification), on which see §1.4.2.1.6. Fantham calls attention to Livy’s use “in a prayer” of (nominative) *populus* as a vocative. The form occurs in Livy 1.24.7, in an enunciation of a fetial priest – an oath binding Rome and Alba Longa prior to the combat of the Horatii and Curiatii (during the reign of Rome’s third king, Tullus Hostilius; see §8.7.2).

[33] Benveniste 2001[=1945]:441–443. The similarity has not gone unnoticed; Fantham (1998:233; following the quotation just given) writes: “Denis Feeney suggests [Ovid] may be imitating the authority as well as the manner of Cato, . . . The prayer is divided more or less equally between requests for pardon of inadvertent past offences 747–62, and for future material benefits 763–76.” It is of greater likelihood, however, that both Ovid and Cato are drawing on primitive tradition: as detailed in the discussions that follow, the prayer and rites of Pales that Ovid preserves give evidence, independent of parallels to Cato’s prayer to Mars, of an archaic Indo-European heritage.

[34] As in, *inter alia*, Benveniste 1969:1:279.

[35] The translation is that of Woodard 2006:102–103 with modification.

[36] Benveniste 2001[=1945]:442. On Cato’s prayer, see also Watkins 1995:197–213 and Woodard 2006:102–118.

[37] Benveniste 2001[=1945]:443. The translations are those that appear in Woodard 2006.

[38] Benveniste 2001[=1945]:442.

[39] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:106 with modification.

[40] Benveniste 2001[=1945]:440. Benveniste is here addressing the retention of the ancestral Indo-European tripartition in the structure of the Pre-Capitoline triad consisting of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus: "In contrast to Jupiter and Mars, who represent, respectively, magical kingship and military might, Quirinus embodies a class of citizens, a 'third estate,' whose work is essentially rural." See §5.3.1.

[41] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004.

[42] See Keith 1967:1:16.

[43] Benveniste 2001[=1945]:442–443.

[44] "*Taitt. Samh.*" is the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, a principal recension of the *Black Yajurveda*.

[45] On the use (in line 747) of "*consule* with the dative as a stronger form of *faue* in prayer to a deity," see Fantham 1998:233.

[46] For discussion of the early scholarship, see Schmitt 1967:16–17,

214–215.

[47] See Benveniste 1969:1:47–61; 1970. Additional evidence for the Indo-European sense is provided by Germanic.

[48] See Watkins 1995:210n20.

[49] Putter (1997) would see in Ovid's lines the source material for many Medieval and Renaissance literary descriptions of the primeval flood. One might wonder, given the primitive ideology reflected in these lines, if a common origin of much greater antiquity underlies all.

[50] See, *inter alia*, Benveniste 1969:1:48–50; 1970:307–310; Schmitt 1967:214–216; Watkins 1995:210–211.

[51] Watkins 1995:211. Watkins reconstructs the Indo-European prayer formula as **pah$_2$- wih$_x$ro- peǩu-*, 'protect men and livestock'; regarding the choice of the verb root **pah$_2$-* (earlier **peh$_2$-*; see, *inter alia*, Rix:2001:460; Watkins 2000:61), which is not attested in any of the cited Italic and Indo-Iranian formulae, Watkins writes (p. 213): "I restore **pah$_2$-* as a likely candidate for the Indo-European lexical expression because it is used in both Indic and Iranian in the traditional trifunctional enumeration of the three scourges in the texts adduced by Benveniste." The reference to Benveniste is to those formulae from the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* and the Darius inscription that were cited in the preceding section (§1.4.2.1.3). See also Watkins 1979.

[52] Watkins 1995:211–212.

[53] Watkins 1995:213.

[54] Griffith 1995:122. See also Bloomfield 1899:77; Whitney-Lanman 1905:134–135.

[55] For discussion of the Sabine god, see §7.4.1, and the following note.

[56] Poultney 1959:252; see also pp. 253–254; on affiliation with Semo Sancus, see Woodard 2006:10, 121, 184, 204.

[57] On Prestota Çerfia of Çerfus Martius, see Woodard 2006:114 and 221n57.

[58] On Cerus, see Woodard 2006:114–117.

[59] See Poultney 1959:289.

[60] Benveniste 1969:1:59; 1970:318.

[61] The translation is that of Palmer (Benveniste 1973:51).

[62] Benveniste 1969:1:48; 1970:308 – citing Lüders 1917:368 (republished as Lüders 1940; see pp. 457–458). With regard to Lüders, see also Sittig 1924:210–211.

[63] Benveniste 1969:1:48; 1970:30.

[64] Gershevitch 1959:182.

[65] Sittig 1924:210–211.

[66] Benveniste 1970:308n3.

[67] Watkins 1995:211.

[68] Watkins 1995:211n23.

[69] Ernout and Meillet 1959:378.

[70] On the *magister populi*, see, *inter alia*, Valditara 1989; Cornell 1995:235–236; Alföldi 1965:43–44, 81–84. In origin, *populus* in the title of the office must refer to the large contingent of Roman society rather than having simply a military denotation of 'the infantry' as opposed to 'the cavalry', with its *magister equitum*, on which see immediately following. For Alföldi (1965:43 with n3 [see also p. 84]), *populus* here translates into "the totality of the Romans, including the aristocracy."

[71] On the *magister equitum*, see, *inter alia*, Brennan 2001:43–49.

[72] "Varro's speculative etymology of 'magister equitum' . . . is (as so often) clearly factitious," writes Brennan (2001:265n114).

[73] Cornell 1995:236. Compare Alföldi 1965:81–84.

[74] Cornell 1995:236. See also p. 443nn78–79, with references.

[75] Regarding this pair – *magister populi* and *magister equitum* – it is singularly intriguing that the former is not permitted (κατὰ δή τινα νόμον παλαιόν 'according to a certain ancient law'; Plutarch *Life of Fabius Maximus* 4.1) to mount the animal with which the latter, his subordinate, is fundamentally associated (see also Livy 23.14.2). One cannot help but be reminded of the similar relationship between the Flamen Dialis (priest of Jupiter) and his subordinate (see Festus p. 185M) the Flamen Martialis (priest of Mars), the former of whom is prohibited from having contact with a horse, the martial animal. This obvious similarity has not gone unnoticed: Momigliano (1966:17) draws attention to the two restrictions, if not to draw them into a parallel relationship.

[76] On the identification of the *equites* in Roman society, see Wiseman 1970, with references to earlier work, particularly Nicolet 1966, the occasion for Wiseman's article. See also McCall 2002.

[77] Mynors 1994:297.

[78] See Mynors 1994:296–297; Adams 1995:68–69.

[79] On the *magister pecoris* as a slave overseeing other herders, see, *inter alia*, Carlsen 1992 and 2001:121; Frayn 1984:97, 181.

[80] And within a primitive Indo-European context, a triple set of *magister populi*, *magister equitum*, *magister pecoris* surely captures one's attention.

[81] On the Roman *vilicus*, see, *inter alia*, Carlsen 2001.

[82] For the fundamental charge of the *magister pecoris*, see also Servius *Aeneid* 7.485.

[83] Regarding this passage, Brunt (1971:334) notes that "Varro simply assumes that the *pastores* will be slaves."

[84] Brunt (1971:374) writes: "As dictator, Caesar enacted that one-third of the herdsmen in Italy should be free." Suetonius's wording would suggest that the default applications of the enactment bear specifically on the city. Brunt speculates that "it might be doubted if he hoped that townsmen in Rome would betake themselves to the hard, lonely life of the shepherd" and that one might equally doubt that Caesar's measure took effect; though in a later work (1975 [see p. 627n28]), Brunt notes that his 1971 discussion of this material is in need of modification.

[85] Carlsen (1992:63) observes (citing Scheidel 1990 on the prospect of free-born and manumitted "bailiffs"):

. . . like the majority of bailiffs the *magistri pecoris* must certainly have been slaves though the possibility of non-slave chief herdsmen can not be excluded. The *magister pecoris* had his own *peculium*, and the manumitted or even perhaps freeborn chief herdsmen may have existed even if from the point of view of Roman private law they were less suitable to act as the master's representatives.

[86] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:105.

[87] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:105, with modification.

[88] On the Fordicidia, see the discussion in Boyle and Woodard 2004:246–248. On Vedic parallels, see Dumézil 1996:372–374.

[89] For references and discussion, see Dumézil 1996:220–224.

[90] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:102, with modification.

[91] As appears to be the case when the comments of Servius (*Aeneid* 8.552) regarding the Flamen Martialis's not being subject to the restrictions that govern the Flamen Dialis (Flamen of Jupiter) are taken in conjunction with Cassius Dio's account (43.24.4) of the sacrifice of two Roman soldiers in what amounts to a peculiar variant of the sacrifice of the Equus October: the sacrifice is performed by the Pontifices and πρὸς τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἄρεως 'by the priest of Mars' (see, *inter alia*, Dumézil 1996:154, with n12; and Pascal 1981:262n9 for references to earlier work). On the parallel relationship provided by the *magister populi* and *magister equitum*, see note 83.

[92] On *faba*, its generative powers, and the Pythagorean prohibition against eating beans, see, *inter alia*, Delatte 1930; Detienne 1994:49–52; Andrews 1949:278–280; Scarborough 1982.

[93] It is of course not the fruit of the *faba*, the bean itself, that is being provided for Pales within her fumigant; it is *stipulas fabales* '*faba* stalks' (*Fasti* 4. 725), *durae culmen inane fabae* 'hard bean's empty stalk' (4.734). As with the other two constituents, this ingredient is not one typically ingested by humans; Pliny (*HN* 22.140–141), however, notes that the 'ashes of *faba* stalks and pods' (*fabalium . . . siliquarumque cinis*) provide relief from hip and tendon pains, and that *faba* husks (*cortices*) are used to regulate the bowels. The medicinal properties of *faba* also entail its use as treatment for colic, incurable coughs, boils, genital ailments, tumors, bruises and burns, and the voice.

[94] See Frazer 1929:3:342–343, 363–365.

[95] See Mannhardt 1875–77:2:310.

[96] Frazer 1929:3:343.

[97] Frazer here cites the Rev. J. Robertson in Sinclair 1791–1799:11:620–621.

[98] Frazer here cites the Rev. Mr. Shaw in Thomas Pennant's "A Tour in Scotland, 1769," in Pinkerton 1808–1814:3:136.

[99] Frazer here cites Trevelyan 1909:22–24.

[100] Frazer here cites the Rev. Dr. Thomas Bisset in Sinclair 1791–1799:5:84.

[101] Frazer 1929:3:339. On the various celebrations of St. George's Day, see also Frazer 1935:part1:2:324–348.

[102] Frazer 1929:3:341.

[103] Heurgon 1951.

[104] Dumézil 1996:382. See also Dumézil 1969:279:

Après une présentation générale de la *pecuria quaestio* (ch. 1), il vient d'être longuement parlé des moutons (ch. 2), des chèvres (ch. 3), des porcs (ch. 4); il sera désormais question des bœufs et des vaches (ch. 5), des ânes (ch. 6), des chevaux (ch. 7), des mulets et des bardots (ch. 8). L'arrivée de Lucienus au début du chapitre 5 est un intermède plaisant et, en même temps, donne à l'auteur l'occasion de bien souligner, comme il aime le faire, les divisions de son développement . . . .

[105] Dumézil 1996:382.

2 And Romulus Disappears

2.1 Introduction

The moment of Romulus's disappearance, the moment of the flight of the *populus Romanus* before an invading warrior horde, the moment of the element of fecundity's delivery of the *populus* from warrior-crisis – these are all moments ritually remembered in Roman cult. But the disposition of these moments within the Roman calendar is a matter of some fluidity.

2.2 On a Conflation of Days

As noted earlier (§1.2.), Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.2.14) conflates the day of the Poplifugia and that of the Nones of July; that is, he assigns both to the day of the Nones:

> *Piso ait Vitulam Victoriam nominari. Cuius rei hoc argumentum profert, quod postridie Nonas Iulias re bene gesta, cum pridie populus a Tuscis in fugam versus sit – unde Poplifugia vocantur – post victoriam certis sacrificiis fiat vitulatio*.
>
> Piso says that it is [the goddess] Victory who is named Vitula. He offers this argument for the claim, that on the day after the Nones of July there was a great success, when the *populus* had turned in flight from the Etruscans the day before – and so it is called the Poplifugia – and after the victory they offered a *vitulatio*[1] along with certain sacrifices.

Plutarch does the same – or at least something similar: he writes that a single day ὄχλου φυγὴ καλεῖται, καὶ νῶναι Καπρατῖναι 'is called the Flight of the Throng [i.e., the Poplifugia], and the Nonae Capratinae' (*Rom.* 29.2 [see §2.3.]; cf. *Cam.* 33.5–6; and note *Capratinae* rather than *Caprotinae*). As underscored at the end of Chapter 1, the Nones of July have a particular significance in Roman mythic-historic tradition: it is the calamitous day on which Romulus was said to have disappeared from earth in the midst of a violent storm.

2.2.1 July 7: Romulus Disappears

It is Cicero (*Rep*. 1.16.25) who first commits to the day of Romulus's disappearance, writing of an eclipse that occurred *Nonis Quinctilibus* 'on the Quinctilian Nones' (Quinctilis, or Quintilis, being the former name of July), the day when Romulus was snatched away *ad humanum exitum* 'to human demise': again, the Nones of this month occur on the seventh day, as with March, May, and October – months of 31 days (see §2.2.2). And it is in the context of identifying the day of Romulus's disappearance that Plutarch makes reference to the Poplifugia co-occurring with the Nonae Capratinae (*Rom*. 29.2, just cited; cf. *Cam*. 33.6–7 [see §2.3..]), marking the date as the Nones of Quintilis (*Rom*. 27.3; and see *Cam*. 33.5). Plutarch similarly states that Romulus disappeared on the Nonae Capratinae at *De Fortuna Romanorum* 8, incorporating a mention of the occurrence, à la Cicero, of a solar eclipse (see §5.3.4).

2.2.1.1 The Ambiguous Poet.

Not all of the evidence, however, points so straightforwardly to a conflation of the day of the Poplifugia and the Nones of July (vis-à-vis the disappearance of Romulus or otherwise). In his *Fasti*, Ovid is more ambiguous: like Plutarch, the exiled poet reveals a linkage between the disappearance of Romulus and some *poplifugium* 'flight of the people'. Beneath the heading of the Quirinalia of February 17, Ovid writes (*Fasti* 2:491–496):[2]

Est locus, antiqui Caprae dixere paludem:
Forte tuis illic, Romule, iura dabas
Sol fugit, et removent subeuntia nubila caelum,
Et gravis effusis decidit imber aquis.
Hinc tonat, hinc missis abrumpitur ignibus aether:
Fit fuga, rex patriis astra petebat equis.
There is a place, the ancients called it the Goat's Marsh;
There, Romulus, you were giving folk justice.
The sun flees and looming stormclouds steal the sky,

Heavy rain tumbles in a downpour.
Thunder roars, and the fire-bolts split the air;
People flee; the king soared starward on his father's steeds.

Fit fuga (translated 'people flee') in line 495, anticipated by *sol fugit* ('the sun flees') in line 493, must certainly be a reference to the celebration of *poplifugium*. But while Ovid, like Cicero and Plutarch, reports a retreat of the sun at the time of Romulus's apotheosis (a transformation into Quirinus; see §2.3.) and knows the traditional site of the warrior-king's disappearance from earth, the Caprae Palus

('Goat's Marsh') within the Campus Martius (see §2.2.4), he gives no suggestion of assigning the date of the ancient festival of the Poplifugia to the Nones of July.

2.2.2 July 5: Romulus Disappears

Dionysius of Halicarnassus has sometimes been cited as endorsing the view that the Poplifugia were celebrated on the Nones (i.e., July 7, rather than July 5).[3] This is not, however, a necessary interpretation of Dionysius's words on the subject. In the view of Dionysius, Romulus was more likely murdered than transported to heaven; he notes the tradition that while Romulus was holding an assembly of the people (ἐκκλησιάζω), he was killed ὑπὸ τῶν νεοπολιτῶν Ῥωμαίων 'by the new citizens of Rome' (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.5 [to whom he was accused of showing less favor than to the earlier citizens (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.5)]):

> . . . ἐπιχειρῆσαι δ' αὐτοὺς τῷ φόνῳ καθ' ὃν χρόνον ἡ ζάλη καὶ τὸ σκότος ἐγένετο διασκεδασθέντος ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ δήμου καὶ μονωθέντος τῆς φυλακῆς τοῦ ἡγεμόνος. διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν φασι τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ τὸ πάθος ἐγένετο τῆς τροπῆς τοῦ πλήθους ἐπώνυμον εἶναι καὶ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων ὄχλου φυγὴν καλεῖσθαι.
>
> . . . and that they carried out the murder at a time when a storm came up and it became dark – the people having scattered from their assembling and the sovereign deserted by his guard. And they say that, for this very reason, the day on which the incident occurred took its name from the flight (τροπή) of the masses (πλῆθος) and down to our own time is called the Flight of the Throng [i.e. the Poplifugia].

Dionysius's remarks could of course just as easily be construed to mean that he understands Romulus to have disappeared on the day that is independently attested, and marked in the calendar, as the festival day of the Poplifugia – in other words, July 5. This must certainly be the default interpretation. Dionysius's words entail a necessary equation in his view of the day of Romulus's disappearance and of the Poplifugia; they do not entail a necessary equation of the day of the Poplifugia and the Nones of July (July 7).

In his *Life of Numa* (2.1), Plutarch himself writes that the day on which Romulus disappeared in the midst of the storm, when the panic-stricken masses scattered and fled, was the *fifth* day of the month, ἣν νῦν ἡμέραν νώνας Καπρατίνας καλοῦσι 'which day they now call the Nonae Capratinae'. The Nones occur on the seventh day of months, such as July, that have 31 days, and on the fifth day of

months having fewer than 31 days: the Nones of July unquestionably occur on July 7; the day is so marked in the single Republican calendar we possess and in the Imperial calendars: this is non-controversial. Why then does Plutarch refer to July 5 as the "Capratine Nones"?

2.2.3 July 5 and July 7 as the Nones

One could imagine that the answer to the preceding question might lie in the use of an attributive adjective to identify this day: it is the day "they now call the *Capratine* Nones." Perhaps we are to understand Plutarch as preserving in these words an occasionally or optionally (and not systematically) recognized distinction between the "Capratine Nones," observed on July 5, and the (unmodified and actual Quinctilian) Nones observed on July 7 – the latter plainly marked by the calendars. The *fifth* day is, after all, the day of the Nones in many months (those with fewer than 31 days), and what one might call a "folk application" of the Nonal designation to July 5 is conceivable.

I am reminded of a custom of rural eastern North Carolina (though hardly unique to that place), still known though no longer observed (except on the Outer Banks), of celebrating *Old Christmas* (like "Capratine Nones" a festival name bearing an attributive adjective) as opposed to, or in addition to, *Christmas* – the single-day holiday of December 25. The term "Old Christmas" developed secondarily as a folk denotation for the celebration of January 5 (or 6), the day on which Christmas was celebrated in Britain prior to the adoption of the Gregorian calendar in 1752. In Britain and many of its colonies (including North Carolina), the masses continued to observe the holiday's former date of January 5 (attested as late as 1889 in Britain),[4] some continuing to refer to the day as "Christmas," but restyling it as "Old." The world's calendrical traditions are undoubtedly well acquainted with such nomenclatural phenomena.

None of this, however, is to say that there is no application of the term *Caprotine* or *Capratine Nones* to the actual Nones of July (i.e., July 7); there is. If one reads continuously from the outset of Varro's discussion of festival days in *De lingua Latina* 6, his lines on the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae at 6.18 naturally present themselves as – in keeping with the sequentially proceeding festival discussions that precede (. . . *Vestalia*, June 9; lesser *Quinquatrus*, June 13; the festival of Fors Fortuna, June 24 [*Ling.* 6.17]); and that follow (*Neptunalia*, July 23; *Furrinalia*, July 25; *Portunalia*, August 17 [*Ling.* 6.19] . . .) – a chronologically ordered discussion of two separate festival days:

Dies Poplifugia videtur nominatus, quod eo die tumultu repente fugerit populus: non multo enim post hic dies quam decessus Gallorum ex Urbe, et qui tum sub Urbe populi, ut Ficuleates ac Fidenates et finitimi alii, contra nos coniurarunt. Aliquot huius diei vestigia fugae in sacris apparent, de quibus rebus Antiquitatum Libri plura referunt. Nonae Caprotinae, quod eo die in Latio Iunoni Caprotinae mulieres sacrificant et sub caprifico faciunt; . . . .

The Poplifugia appears to be so called because on this day the *populus* suddenly fled in disorder: this day is not much after that of the retreat of the Gauls from Rome, and the people who were then close by Rome, such as the Ficuleans and Fidenians and other neighbors, conspired against us. Some vestiges of the flight of this day appear in the rites, about which matters the *Books of the Antiquities* have more to report. The Nonae Caprotinae [are so called] because on this day in Latium women sacrifice to Juno Caprotina, and they do so underneath a *caprificus*; . . . .

As we have just seen (§2.2.2), Plutarch places the Nonae Capratinae on July 5 at *Life of Numa* 2.1, calling it the day of Romulus's disappearance. However, at *Life of Camillus* 33.5 he writes of the Roman warriors' going out from the city to rescue the slave-women from the Latin camp (the aetiology of the Nonae Caprotinae) on the Nones of the month that was at the time of the event called "Quintilis," but in his own day is called "July" – and suggests that the ritual commemorating that event still continued to be celebrated on that day (also see *Rom.* 27.3). Can one actually imagine that Plutarch did not know that the Nones of July in his own lifetime fell on July 7? And then a few lines farther along in the *Life of Camillus* (33.6) he explicitly refers to the same day (the Nones of July) as the Nonae Capratinae (as in *Rom.* 29.2), which term we just saw him assign to July 5 in *Life of Numa*. Many scholars have understandably seen in Plutarch's record a confusion of distinct festival days. The term "confusion" would perhaps be better avoided, but it is difficult to escape the conclusion that, at best, we stand in the presence of a dizzying oscillation – or a fluidity – of nomenclatural usage.

It should also be noted that in the calendar of Polemius Silvius, July 7, the Nones, is designated as *Ancillarum Feriae*, 'Festival of the Slave-Women'. The aetiological account with which we are now quite familiar is included. Macrobius similarly notes: *Nonis Iuliis diem festum esse ancillarum tam vulgo notum est* 'it is commonly known that the festival day of the slave-women is on the Nones of July' (*Sat.* 1.11.36); and soon after (1.11.40), he refers to the same day as the Nonae Caprotinae. Ps-Plutarch attests the triumphant day of the slave-women

as bearing the same denotation, ἑορτὴ θεραπαινῶν, without remarking on the date (*Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30).

2.2.4 Different – But the Same

To summarize briefly – the evidence certainly reveals that the Poplifugia and the events of the Nones of July (July 7), called the Nonae Caprotinae, are thematically and ritually linked, but there can be little doubt that the Poplifugia were celebrated on July 5. The ancient Roman calendars assign the festival to that date: the Poplifugia are so designated in the *Fasti Maffeiani* (CIL I² 222–228), *Amiternini* (CIL I² 243–245), and *Antiates Ministrorum domus Augustae* (CIL I² 247–249). There is no *calendar* that assigns the Poplifugia to the Nones (July 7). Moreover, in his discussion of the two, as we have seen, Varro (*Ling.* 6.18) treats the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae as separate and sequential phenomena.[5] The calendars confirm that the Nones of July occur on July 7, the day of the *Ancillarum Feriae*, 'Festival of the Slave-Women', which festival is also equated with the celebration of the Nonae Caprotinae. But some sources, in turn, clearly assign the Nonae Caprotinae to the same day as the Poplifugia, Plutarch specifying July 5 as the date. And so we come full circle. What are we to make of all of this?

2.3 Variant Aetiologies

We saw in Chapter 1 that in his description of the ritual events of the Nones of July in the *Life of Camillus* (33.5–6), Plutarch describes throngs of people departing the city while calling out various names: he presents this as a processional and verbal re-enactment of the actions of Roman warriors who, at the moment of the historical inception of these rituals, were placing themselves in formation as they hurriedly set out for the camp of the intoxicated, sex-sated, sleeping Latin soldiers, would-be abductors of Roman free-born women. At the conclusion of his narration of the ritual events of the Nonae Caprotinae and their origins at *Life of Camillus* 33.7, Plutarch makes brief reference to the variant aetiological account – that of the disappearance of Romulus – and, obliquely, to the ritual acts and enunciations (δρᾶσθαι καὶ λέγεσθαι):

> Ἕτεροι δὲ τούτων τὰ πλεῖστα δρᾶσθαι καὶ λέγεσθαί φασιν ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Ῥωμύλου πάθει· κατὰ ταύτην γὰρ ἀφανισθῆναι τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτὸν ἔξω πύλης, ζόφου καὶ θυέλλης ἄφνω περισχούσης, ὡς δ' ἔνιοι νομίζουσιν, ἐκλείψεως ἡλίου γενομένης, ...
>
> But others tell that most of what is performed and spoken

> concerns the fate of Romulus: for on this day he disappeared outside of the gates, with a sudden dark gloom and storm swirling around, and, as some think, in a solar eclipse, ...

He, Romulus, vanished while addressing an assembly of the people (δημηγορέω), from the Goat's Marsh, the Caprae Palus, and it is for this reason that the day is called the Capratine Nones (*Cam.* 33.7) – as opposed to the variant aetiology that derives the name from the *caprificus* 'wild fig', the tree from which Tutula sent her signal (see *Cam.* 33.6; Varro *Ling.* 6.18; Macrobius *Sat.* 1.11.36,40). Plutarch then concludes this discussion in the *Life of Camillus* by referring his readers to his *Life of Romulus*.

In the latter work, Plutarch offers additional details regarding this variant aetiological account. Here one reads (*Romulus* 27.2–28.3) that on the day of his disappearance, Romulus was holding an assembly (ἐκκλησία) in the area of the Goat's Marsh when the darkness and storm came on. In the midst of the maelstrom, the great mass of people scattered and fled (τὸν μὲν πολὺν ὄχλον σκεδασθέντα φυγεῖν). In contrast to the fleeing masses, the men of rank (οἱ δυνατοί) remained in the space of the assembly and huddled together. After the tempest and darkness had passed, the masses returned, seeking the king. The masses (ὁ ὄχλος) are depicted as if they were so many confused, wide-eyed children, whom these men of rank dismiss without allowing them to inquire about what has happened, telling the masses to revere Romulus as he has been carried up to the gods and deified. Most of the people accept the account, though some confront the patricians over the stupidity of the tale, regarding them, the patricians, as murderers of Romulus (touching on the homicidal account of Romulus's disappearance, mentioned in §2.2.2). It is subsequent to this charge that one Julius Proculus addresses the masses in the Forum, swearing that the deified Romulus had appeared to him and announced that he, Romulus, has become the god Quirinus.[6] The people are convinced.

After rehearsing various Greek mythic accounts (μυθολογούμενα) of a similar nature (*Rom.* 28.4–8), Plutarch turns to interpretation of elements of the tradition of Romulus's apotheosis and associated rites (*Rom.* 29.1–2). The day of its celebration, he notes, is called not only the Flight of the Throng (i.e., the Poplifugia) but also the Nonae Capratinae:

> διὰ τὸ θύειν εἰς τὸ τῆς αἰγὸς ἕλος ἐκ πόλεως κατιόντας· τὴν γὰρ αἶγα κάπραν ὀνομάζουσιν. ἐξιόντες δὲ πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ὀνομάτων φθέγγονται μετὰ βοῆς, οἷον Μάρκου, Λουκίου,

Γαΐου, μιμούμενοι τὴν τότε τροπὴν καὶ ἀνάκλησιν ἀλλήλων μετὰ δέους καὶ ταραχῆς.

because they return from the city to the Goat's Marsh [Caprae Palus] to sacrifice: for they call the female goat *capra*. And as they go out to the sacrifice, they enunciate with a shout many of the local names – such as Marcus, Lucius, Gaius – replicating the former flight and the calling out to one another in the midst of fear and disorder.

In Plutarch's first account of this ritual that we encountered (*Cam.* 33.5 [see §1.3.1]), the enunciative act and procession ritually replicate warriors calling out to one another as they quickly order themselves into fighting formation and march out of the city toward victory in battle following the neutralization of the Latin horde by Roman slave-women (and see §7.5.1). In the present Plutarchian account, in stark contrast, the enunciative act and procession ritually replicate the fearful cries of the masses' fleeing in disorder at the moment of the disappearance of Romulus. In the variant aetiologies of this Roman ritual of enunciation and movement, both of the commemorated events are set in the space of the Campus Martius; but one marks the *onset of crisis* at the vanishing of Romulus (ὄχλου φυγή, i.e., the 'Poplifugia'); the other, involving the matter of Tutula and her slave-women, marks the *resolution of crisis* (the Nonae Capratinae).

This aetiological account of the disappearance of Romulus and its interpretation having been presented (*Rom.* 27.2–29.2), Plutarch then also rehearses in this work the alternative account of the Nonae Capratinae involving the Latin demand for Roman women that he related in the *Life of Camillus* (discussed earlier). And having done so, he surmises that the ritual calling out of names and procession to the Goat's Marsh seem to be better applied to the disappearance-of-Romulus version than to the other εἰ μὴ νὴ Δία τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας ἐν χρόνοις ἑτέροις ἀμφότερα τὰ πάθη συνέτυχε γενέσθαι 'unless, indeed, both of the incidents happened to occur on the same day in different times' (*Romulus* 29.7); and thus the *Life of Romulus* ends. Whatever Plutarch's intent in offering this last observation might have been, the duality of ritual observances that he invokes likely lies at the heart of the "confusion" with which the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae are beset.

2.4 The Poplifugia and the Crisis of the Warrior

A familiar pattern emerges – one that is familiar from the ritual events that occur at the boundary of the Roman year: the inauspiciously

scheduled[7] Regifugium of February 24 and Second Equirria of March 14, the latter with its Mamuralia, and the disorder that the two ritually embody – and the return to order that ensues with the onset of the new year. Like the Poplifugia, they are flight rituals: the Regifugium is the traumatic retreat of the cult specialist, the Rex Sacrorum, out of the sacred space of the Comitium; while the Mamuralia is the traumatic retreat of the military specialist out of an urban space, nebulously identified as the space of the city (we shall return to a discussion of these in §4.3.3). What the ancient sources reveal of *poplifugium*, regardless of which interpretative version is embraced, is the picture of a *populus* 'people' in a moment of trauma and retreat, which event, along with the subsequent restoration, is annually celebrated in mid-year ritual.

2.4.1 Crisis of the Invading Enemy

In the various accounts of the aetiology of the festival, a flight of the Roman people is precipitated by a crisis within the domain of the warrior. For Varro (*Ling.* 6.18) the flight occurred in a weakened moment subsequent to the Gallic incursion when Latin armies of the Ficulaeans and Fidenians advanced against the Romans: *eo die tumultu repente fugerit populus* 'on this day the *populus* suddenly fled in disorder'. For Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.2.14) the flight was a retreat of the *populus* from an Etruscan assault: *populus a Tuscis in fugam versus sit*. In the case of Latin military incursion, restoration came with the now well-rehearsed events of the Nonae Caprotinae, annually commemorated ritually. While, as we have seen, Macrobius also preserves the aetiological account of these Caprotine Nones, linking them to Roman weakness following the Gallic invasion and Latin opportunism (*Sat.* 1.11.37), he presents, in contrast, the resolution of the crisis of the Poplifugia as a Roman military victory over the Etruscans, and one that occurred on the *following day* – which, let us recall, for Macrobius would be the day after the Nones of July (see §2.2.):[8] accordingly, after this Roman success there is observed on that day a "*vitulatio* with certain sacrifices" (*Sat.* 3.2.14). This *vitulatio* is some ritual enunciative act, one that a pontifex typically performs in certain rites, to judge from a line that Macrobius quotes (*Sat.* 3.2.11) from the fifteenth book of Varro's *Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum*:[9]

> *Nam primo pontificii iuris libro apud Pictorem verbum hoc positum est*, vitulari, *de cuius verbi significatu Titius ita retulit:* Vitulari est voce laetari. *Varro etiam in libro quinto decimo* Rerum divinarum

ita refert, quod pontifex in sacris quibusdam vitulari soleat, quod Graeci παιανίζειν vocant.

For example, in the first book of pontifical law – [Fabius] Pictor's – one finds this word, *vitulari*, about the meaning of which Titius reported: "*Vitulari* means 'to rejoice with the voice'." And Varro, in the fifteenth book of his *Rerum divinarum*, states that "in certain sacred rites the Pontifex is accustomed to *vitulari*, which the Greeks call παιανίζειν 'to chant the paean'.

To this extent, *vitulatio* is reminiscent of Plutarch's ritual ἀνάκλησις of the Nonae Capratinae, the calling out of names such as Gaius, Marcus, and Lucius as the people move in procession.[10] Warren would see a mention of *vitulatio* in the fragmentary archaic inscription on the *cippus* found beneath the Niger Lapis (on which inscription, see §3.2.2.1).[11]

2.4.2 Crisis of the Disappearing Romulus

The tradition that links the Poplifugia with the disappearance of Romulus, per Plutarch, Ovid, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, is no less one in which crisis in the warrior domain is conspicuous. Romulus's traumatic disappearance, which sets off the stampede commemorated by the Poplifugia, is situated within the geographic domain of the Campus Martius (Livy 1.16.1; Dionysius *Ant. Rom.* 2.56.2), the warrior space dedicated to Mars beyond the *pomerium* (again, the sacred boundary of urban Rome). This space may only hold this martial significance *synchronically* in the periods in which the attested traditions of Romulus's disappearance were being recorded, since the Campus Martius is commonly said to have been land that was owned by the Tarquins, the last of Rome's kings, that was confiscated after the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus and then dedicated to Mars (see, *inter alia*, Livy 2.4.2–3), though Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 5.13.2–3) holds that the field had already been dedicated to the war god as a place to pasture horses and for young men to practice their warrior skills prior to the time of the Tarquins. Beyond that, Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 4.22.1) describes how Tullus Hostilius, Rome's third king, had, after conducting a census, assembled the army in the "largest field before the city" and offered a *suovetaurilia*, the sacrifice of a boar (*sus*), a ram (*ovis*), and a bull (*taurus*) (on which see the following discussion), τῷ κατέχοντι τὸ πεδίον Ἄρει 'to Mars who possesses the field': the reference is certainly to the Campus Martius. And one finds in Festus (p. 189M) a reference to a certain law of Numa Pompilius (predecessor of Tullus Hostilius) regarding the disposition of the arms of a defeated enemy, *spolia*

opima, to the gods: the ritual is said to be of three types; the second, *secunda spolia*, entails offering a *solitaurilia* (i.e., a *suovetaurilia*) to Mars *in Campo* (i.e., in the Campus Martius). One could imagine that the tradition envisions Numa, Romulus's successor on the Roman throne and bringer of order to Roman society, as codifier of a practice that preceded his own peaceful reign.[12] In Livy's account (1.16.1–2), Romulus disappeared while holding a public assembly *in Campo* for the purpose of taking a census of the army – an activity that itself would entail the offering of a lustral sacrifice of the *suovetaurilia* (Livy 1.44.1–3; Dionysius *Ant. Rom.* 4.22.1–2 [see immediately preceding]; Valerius Maximus 4.1.10).

There are other clear indications that the disappearance of Romulus is a crisis of the warrior. Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.1) explicitly states that Romulus would have conquered more of the neighboring peoples had he not abruptly come to the end of his existence while being in the prime age for war-making: the warrior Romulus has been lost to the society for which he performed the role of war-maker – he ceases to function in his proper role. Dionysius adds (2.56.2–3) that Romulus at his disappearance was believed to have been snatched up by his father, Mars, the warrior deity. In exploring the significance of the name given to the deified Romulus (i.e., *Quirinus*), Plutarch (*Rom.* 29.1–2) rehearses the etymological view that the deity was called Quirinus because he was ἀρήϊος 'martial' or αἰχμητὴς θεός a 'spear-wielding god': the theonym *Quirinus* was in antiquity etymologically lumped together with *curis*, said to be a Sabine word meaning 'spear' (see §8.7.2.4.2).

2.5 The Problem of Direction

As we have seen, Plutarch records that on the day of the Poplifugia, throngs of people exit the city while 'they enunciate with a shout many of the local names' (*Rom.* 29.2). Much as the Rex Sacrorum flees from the Comitium at the time of the Regifugium, and Mamurius Veturius flees from the city on the day of the Second Equirria, the *populus* moves from the space of urban Rome – that is, across the *pomerium* – into that of the Campus Martius, in the vicinity of the Caprae Palus, the 'Goat's Marsh'.

But the ritual of the Poplifugia seems to be inconsistent with its aetiology: the masses are moving in the wrong direction if they are meant to be rehearsing the terrified flight of people *from* the Campus Martius on the day of Romulus's disappearance. The procession with the accompanying enunciation (ἀνάκλησις) 'replicates, imitates' (μιμέομαι) the flight (that is, the 'route' τροπή) and calling out to one

another ‘in the midst of fear and disorder’ (μετὰ δέους καὶ ταραχῆς) as the darkening of the sun and violent storms drove the masses *away from* the area of the Goat’s Marsh. It was then that ‘the great throng of people scattered and fled’ (τὸν μὲν πολὺν ὄχλον σκεδασθέντα φυγεῖν; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.6–7). The masses subsequently wandered back – ‘came together again into the same place’ (τῶν πολλῶν εἰς ταὐτὸ πάλιν συνερχομένων) – into the space of the trauma, when ‘the disorder, the mêlée’ (ταραχή) had ceased and the light returned (*Rom.* 27.7). The ritual imitates, in contrast to the aetiology, a confused flight *into* the Campus Martius. The masses are going the wrong way.[13]

There is a subtle indication that Plutarch is aware of this contradiction (how could he not be?). When he describes this ritual exit of the throng (ὁ ὄχλος) on the day of the Poplifugia, commemorating the ‘people’s flight’, he writes of these masses (*Rom.* 29.2), θύειν εἰς τὸ τῆς αἰγὸς ἕλος ἐκ πόλεως κατιόντας ‘returning out of the city to the Goat’s Marsh [Caprae Palus] to sacrifice’ – and hence, he avows, the same day is also called the Capratine Nones. To denote the procession “out of the city,” Plutarch chooses to use the verb κάτειμι (participle κατιόντας): componentially the sense of the word is ‘to go (εἶμι) down (κατά)’, but κάτειμι (εἰς) regularly conveys the meaning ‘to return (to)’, as in *Odyssey* 15.505 where the phrase κάτειμι εἰς ἄστυ ‘to return to the city’ is used to denote the traveler Telemachus’s re-entry into the urban space of Ithaca, after he has first visited the island’s fields and herdsmen (notably the swineherd Eumaeus). Plutarch is employing the language of a familiar trope: the verb is commonly used of the return, or attempted return, from exile – that is, φυγή ‘flight’ – to the place from which exile occurred. Thus, at Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1282–1283, Cassandra prophecies that there will come one who will avenge Agamemnon’s death, and her own: φυγὰς δ’ ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος κάτεισιν ‘a fugitive [i.e., one who is in flight], a wanderer far from this land, will return’. Compare Herodotus 1.61 (the return of Pisistratus to Athens); 3.45 (the return of Samians banished by Polycrates); 5.62 (the return of Athenians exiled by the Pisistratids); and so on. Plutarch describes the ritual reenactment of the *flight from* the Campus Martius, *from* the locale of the Goat’s Marsh, as a *return to* that space for sacrifice, as if, it seems, this were a *ritual validation* of the reversed direction of the movement – and, by the way, he adds, because of that directionality (toward the Caprae Palus), this day is also known as the Nonae Capratinae. There is an awkwardness to it all.

2.6 Some Conclusions

On July 5, the Romans celebrated the festival of the Poplifugia – day

prominently marked with large letters in the ancient calendars. This is beyond dispute.

To July 7, the Nones of July – a day marked calendrically as the *Ancillarum Feriae* 'Festival of the Slave-Women' – was attached a ritualized memory of some *poplifugium*, entailing a movement of masses though space at a moment of crisis. This can be a hastily arranged military advance against a horde of invading Latin warriors who have been incapacitated by the makeshift strategizing of a clever slave-woman and her followers. Plutarch (*Rom.* 27.3; *Cam.* 33.5) reports that event to have occurred and its ritual celebration to continue to occur on the Nones of Quintilis – i.e., July 7. The *poplifugium* can equally be a chaotic retreat of the *populus Romanus* as Romulus unexpectedly vanishes from Rome in the midst of rain and darkness: Cicero reports that vanishing act to have occurred on the Nones of Quintilis; Plutarch agrees, and acknowledges that this event may underlie the rites of the day (*Cam.* 33.7). These Nones of Quintilis (July 7) are undoubtedly the day called by Varro the Caprotine Nones 'Goat Nones' – a festival day that he situates within the temporal span that stretches between the Poplifugia of July 5 and the Neptunalia of July 23 (*Ling.* 6.18–19). Plutarch too knows the Nones of Quintilis to be 'Goat Nones' – the Capratine Nones, so-called because of the disappearance of Romulus from the vicinity of the Caprae Palus 'Goat's Marsh' or because of the salience of the *caprificus* 'goat fig' in the tale of the slave-women (*Rom.* 29.2, 6; *Cam.* 33.6–7).

The Poplifugia of July 5 recalls no less a movement of the *populus Romanus* through space in a moment of crisis. On the one hand, it is the retreat of the *populus Romanus* from an invading warrior host – typically Latin – in the power vacuum of the aftermath of the Gallic subjugation of Rome – that event that would be resolved by the intervention of Roman slave-women. On the other hand, the straightforward reading of *Antiquitates Romanae* 2.56.5 is that Dionysius understands this day – July 5, clearly marked as Poplifugia in the calendars – also to mark the occasion of the disappearance of Romulus (an event with Caprotine affiliations); Plutarch explicitly states as much (*Numa* 2.1) and gives this day also the denotation *Capratine Nones*. It *is* the fifth day of the month – the day, after all, on which the Nones fall eight months out of the year. Some sort of seismic shifting is clearly observable along this fault line in the Roman festival calendar.

What is perhaps most important to bear in mind at this juncture is that the *poplifugial* ritual complex of July 5 and July 7 is underpinned by two aetiologies: one associated with a Roman experience of warrior-crisis; one associated with the resolution of that warrior-crisis.

The oppression of the *populus Romanus* by a warrior incursion (warrior-crisis); the sudden and traumatic vanishing of Romulus, cut short in his war-making career (warrior-crisis); the slave-women's erotically facilitated delivery of the *populus Romanus* from an invading warrior horde (resolution of warrior-crisis) are all beans within a single pod.

[1] On *vitulatio*, see §2.4.1.

[2] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:41–42, with modification.

[3] Notably, and long ago, by Schwegler (1853–1858:1:532), who advocated for there being no distinction at all between the day of the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae of July 7. Contra Schwegler's particular excision of a distinct Poplifugia from the calendar, see Mommsen at CIL I² 320–321. To the list of those who make no distinction between the two (Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae) can now be added Rüpke (1995:556–561).

[4] Richards 1998:253–254. For those who celebrated Old Christmas on January 6, the day thus coincided with the ancient Christian festival day of Epiphany. Richards would see the date of Epiphany as a non-factor in the continued celebration of Christmas on the day of its Julian calendrical designation.

[5] These are the traditional arguments that have been mounted against Schwegler's claim that the Poplifugia were celebrated on July 7. See Warde Fowler 1899:175 and Frazer 1929:2:415; and see again Mommsen's remarks, CIL I² 320–321.

[6] For Plutarch, Proculus Julius is a patrician, a man of unimpeachable character, a companion of Romulus's (*Rom.* 28.1). Livy depicts him as shrewd (1.16.5–6). Cicero characterizes him as a peasant (*Rep.*

2.10.20).

[7] “Inauspicious” as they are celebrated on even, rather than odd, days; see §5.3.3.

[8] And would thus be an even-numbered and, hence, inauspicious day.

[9] Augustine (*De civitate Dei* 7.17) writes that in this fifteenth book of *Res divinae*, Varro treats *di incerti* (as distinct from the treatments of *di certi* [book 14] and *di selecti* [book 16]; see Wissowa 1971:67–72). Conte (1994:213), following Augustine (*De civ. D.* 6.3), summarizes the structure of the skeletally attested *Antiquitates* as follows:

The *Antiquitates*, the structure of which is preserved for us by Augustine in the *De civitate Dei*, was articulated according to a plan that consisted of four hexads (groups of six books) in the first part, devoted to *Res humanae*, and five triads (groups of three books) in the second part, devoted to *Res divinae*. Both the first and the second part were preceded by an introductory book. The four sections of the *Res humanae* dealt with men, places, times, and things, respectively. The same subdivision was maintained in the first four sections of the second part, the *Res divinae*, in the sense that religious ceremonies are celebrated by men, in certain places and times. The fifth and last section concerned the gods themselves.

See also, *inter alia*, the summary exposition in Rüpke 2007:59–60. In his remarks on the aetiology of the Poplifugia and *vitulatio*, Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.2.13–14) mentions a goddess Vitula (see §2.2.); at *Ling.* 7.107, Varro derives from her name the participle *vitulantes* (from *vitulari* ‘to utter a cry of joy or exultation’ [OLD]).

[10] For Whatmough (1923:351), “the word apparently means something like ‘jubilation’”; he connects *vitulatio* etymologically with Latin *vitis* (denoting various vines) and *vitulamen* ‘sprig, shoot, sucker’,

and associates the ritual act with a weaving of pliant twigs into garlands, in keeping with the cutting of fig branches on the Nonae Caprotinae. See also Whatmough 1931:175n2.

[11] Warren 1907:263–265.

[12] On the *spolia opima* vis-à-vis Roman ideological preservation of earlier Indo-European ideology, see Dumézil 2000:178–180. On the *suovetaurilia*, see Woodard 2006 passim.

[13] Compare with this the directional reversal that characterizes an aetiology of the Regifugium of February 24. Certain ancient authorities embrace the view that the Regifugium commemorated the flight of Tarquinius Superbus from Rome. However, as Verrius Flaccus (CIL I^2 234) and others make plain, the Tarquin king was reported to be already away from Rome at the time of the insurrection that brought an end to monarchy. Livy (1.60.1) records that Tarquinius was with his army at Ardea when word came of what was happening in Rome, and that he then set off in the direction of the city – not *away* from it. See Woodard 2011:304–307.

3 At the Shrines of Vulcan

3.1 Introduction

The disappearance of Romulus from among the *populus Romanus* has a particular association with the temple of Vulcan. But Vulcan has two temples: one in the area of the Comitium; the other within the space of the Campus Martius, a place that we have already seen to be steeped in the aetiology of the ritual complex of July 5 and July 7. The Comitium itself, however, has a role to play in the tradition of the crisis of the disappearing warrior-king. Characterizing the Volcanal structures of both spaces, Comitium and Campus Martius, is a set of constraints and various shared features.

3.2 Regicide and the Sanctuary of Vulcan

We noted earlier (§2.2.2) in passing that Dionysius of Halicarnassus advocates the greater reliability of an allo-tradition regarding the disappearance of Romulus, which he presents as an aetiology of the Poplifugia: it was murder rather than apotheosis. In addition to the homicidal account mentioned earlier – that certain new citizens of Rome killed Romulus while he was holding an assembly of the people – and did so at an opportune moment when rain and darkness came on and the people had fled (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.5) – Dionysius also rehearses the tradition that patricians murdered Romulus ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ. Greek βουλευτήριον can be used to denote the *architectural space* in which the Roman Senate meets – namely, the Curia (preceded in a more archaic time by the Curia Hostilia), as in Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* 31.1 and Herodian 5.5.7; but βουλευτήριον can also denote the *collective body* of the Senate, and it is clearly in this latter sense that Dionysius had earlier used the term at *Antiquitates Romanae* 2.12.3 in his account of Romulus's establishment of that Roman institution, when he writes:

> οἱ δὲ μετέχοντες τοῦ βουλευτηρίου πατέρες ἔγγραφοι προσηγορεύθησαν καὶ μέχρις ἐμοῦ ταύτης ἐτύγχανον τῆς προσηγορίας.
>
> And the members of the Senate were called *Patres Conscripti* – and it happens that they are so called down to my own time.

But now the patricians have killed Romulus, states Dionysus, because he was behaving like a tyrant; they have dismembered his body, smuggled away the butchered parts hidden in their robes, and secretly buried those remains in the earth (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.3–5).

In his *Life of Romulus*, Plutarch similarly makes reference to an aetiological tradition in which patricians were viewed to be the agents of Romulus's disappearance (27.2–3). He writes that Romulus had treated the Senate with complete contempt; consequently, when he disappeared, suspicion fell on the Senate (as also at *Numa* 2.2–3). It is in the context of these remarks that Plutarch notes the day of Romulus's disappearance to have been the Nones of Quintilis, (i.e., July 7 [see §§2.2.1 and 2.2.3]). After digressing into the death of Scipio Africanus, Plutarch returns to the sudden disappearance of Romulus (*Rom.* 27.5–6) and states that there are those who conjecture that the Senators murdered and dismembered him in the sanctuary of Vulcan (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου), carving up his body and secreting the parts away.

In *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 32, Ps-Plutarch writes of the murder and dismemberment of Romulus, naming the third book of the *Italian History* of Aristobulus as his source. According to this account, Romulus was slain ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ βουλῇ, which would seem to mean, at face value, 'in the midst of the convened Senate', without designating a particular architectural space. The adjective σύγκλητος 'summoned' can be used on its own, substantivally (ἡ σύγκλητος), to denote the Senatorial body, and Ps-Plutarch has used the term in this very sense only a few lines earlier in this same work. However, ἡ σύγκλητος can also denote the Senatorial meeting place: thus, we see Herodian using the word as a synonym for βουλευτήριον, denoting the Curia, in the passage mentioned earlier (Herodian 5.5.7). More immediately, Ps-Plutarch himself appears to use ἡ σύγκλητος to denote the constructed architectural space of the Senatorial meeting in the very next sentence following the account of murder and dismemberment. He writes: Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ μετὰ πυρὸς εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ἕδραμον 'and the Romans ran with fire to the σύγκλητος'. This sudden mention of "fire" in Ps-Plutarch's brief description leaps out at the reader – made the more startling by the very terseness of the account of Romulus's "disappearance" and of the immediate response of the *populus*:

> οἱ δὲ φονεύσαντες αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ βουλῇ καὶ διακόψαντες εἰς τοὺς κόλπους ἔβαλον. Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ μετὰ πυρὸς εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ἕδραμον.

And those who murdered and dismembered him in the midst of

the convened Senate threw [his parts] into their garment folds. And the Romans ran with fire to the σύγκλητος.

End of story, though the author's focus on "fire" should – perhaps – come as no shock, given the centrality of Vulcan's shrine in the aetiology of the Poplifugia, about which much more will soon be said.

The Greek parallel that Ps-Plutarch joins to this Roman account, the story of the murder and dismemberment of the proletariat-loving Pisistratus of Orchomenus by members of the Council (βουλή), offers the *prima facie* suggestion that the Romans who race to the σύγκλητος constitute a potentially destructive force. In the Greek account, a suspicious throng of common people runs to the Council, but Tlesimachus, the youngest son of Pisistratus, who had knowledge of the conspiracy, diverts the throng from the Council: he tricks, and thus pacifies, the mob by reporting that his father has experienced an apotheosis. In the same way, in Ps-Plutarch's conjoined Roman account, one Αἴλιος Πρᾶος (rather than Julius Proculus) persuades the Roman crowd that Romulus has experienced an apotheosis, and so the people withdraw.

Are we to understand that Ps-Plutarch portrays the Romans, who are running with torches, or some other flaming objects, as malicious and intending to set fire to the structure at which the Senators are meeting? This might well be a natural enough reading in the context – a reading perhaps buttressed by the conjoined Greek parallel. Robertson explicitly reveals this to be his understanding of the intent of the *populus*: "For this exciting turn, which evokes the burning of the Senate-house after the death of Clodius Ps-Plutarch[1] himself deserves the credit, as also for the *Schwindelautor* Aristobulus, cited immediately after."[2] Such an interpretation of course entails that σύγκλητος necessarily denotes an architectural structure.

3.2.1 The Sanctuary of Vulcan in Comitio

The structure denoted by Ps-Plutarch's σύγκλητος in *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 32 and that by Dionysius's βουλευτήριον in *Antiquitates Romanae* 2.56.5 – if indeed the terms denote an architectural structure – ought not be the Curia Hostilia, the meetinghouse of the Senate prior to the construction of the Curia (Iulia), which Julius Caesar began and Augustus completed. "Ought not," that is, if these two authors are adhering to traditional Roman chronology in their accounts of the disappearance of Rome's first king, since, as Varro (*Ling.* 5.155) and Livy (1.30.2–3) tell us, the Curia Hostilia was not built until the reign of Tullus Hostilius (second king beyond Romulus), whose name it is said to bear.

Robertson proposes that Ps-Plutarch's σύγκλητος and Dionysius's βουλευτήριον are both used to denote architectural space, and that the designated architecture is the sanctuary of Vulcan, which, as noted earlier, Plutarch explicitly names in his *Life of Romulus* (27.5) as the site of the murder and dismemberment of this warrior-king. In other words, Robertson would see Plutarch and Ps-Plutarch as being consistent in their two accounts regarding the space of the deed in the tradition of Romulus's Forum-area disappearance. Robertson points out, consonant with this view of consistency, that "Dionysius has just mentioned that Romulus and Titus Tatius conducted meetings 'in the shrine of Hephaestus a little above the agora' (2, 50, 2)."[3] The passage to which he refers is one in which Dionysius describes the joint activities of Romulus and the Sabine Titus Tatius early in their co-regency, including the clearing and building up of the Forum area: τὰς συνόδους ἐνταῦθα ἐποιοῦντο ἐν Ἡφαίστου χρηματίζοντες ἱερῷ μικρὸν ὑπερανεστηκότι τῆς ἀγορᾶς 'there they would hold assemblies, deliberating in the sanctuary of Vulcan that projects a little above the Forum'.

The space within which the assembling occurred was that of the Comitium: "From a very early date a consecrated place of assembly existed in the heart of the City: the Comitium, which the lexicographers tell us was originally used for the *comitia curiata*."[4] Nicolet is here making reference to Varro, *De lingua Latina* 5.155, in which passage the antiquarian etymologizes Latin *Comitium*, proposing an origin from *coire* 'to come together' (*coibant* 'they used to come together'), as the Comitium was the space in which the *curiae* (see §5.3.1), population units of early Rome, assembled for deliberation and voting.

One can add to Robertson's observation regarding the mention of the Volcanal in 2.50.2 that farther along in the *Antiquitates Romanae*, Dionysius again describes the sanctuary of Vulcan as the assembly place of the people in later periods in Rome's history – at 6.67.2; 7.17.2; 11.39.1.[5] The first two of these passages depicts the geography of the assembly of the time especially clearly: a large body of the Roman people fills some space of the Forum while the persons addressing the people are positioned at the sanctuary of Vulcan (τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἡφαίστου).

This sanctuary of Vulcan, the Volcanal, can be benchmarked relative to the earlier mentioned Comitium: it is sacred space, the Comitium – that same space from which the Rex Sacrorum annually flees on the day of the Regifugium, as the old year ends, and that same space into which Mars' priests, the Salii, leap on the day of the Quinquatrus, as the new year begins. The probable disposition of the Volcanal is along

the perimeter of the Comitium.[6] Vulcan's sanctuary has a deeply archaic Indo-European heritage: it stands as a Roman instantiation of one of the three canonical Indo-European sacred flames, as Dumézil realized,[7] that one corresponding to the liminal flame of the Vedic Dakṣinā̆gni.[8]

The identification of the Volcanal as a consistently envisioned landmark of Romulus's murder in the accounts of Plutarch, Ps-Plutarch, and Dionysius, à la Robertson's interpretation, is sensibly self-evident, and must be correct. However, Ps-Plutarch's report that the murder occurred ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ βουλῇ 'in the midst of the convened Senate' and Dionysius's that the deed was done ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ 'within the Senate body' must be references not to the *architecture* of Vulcan's shrine but to the gathering of patricians within the adjoining space of the Comitium – the sanctioned space for such a gathering. What sense, then, is to be made of Ps-Plutarch's mention of "fire" in conjunction with the flight of the *populus* to the space of the σύγκλητος – the space of that Senatorial gathering?

3.2.1.1 The Volcanal and the Fire.

If the Forum-region site of Romulus's murder is understood as consistently envisioned as being that of the area of the Volcanal – shrine of the *Fire* god – by Plutarch, Dionysius, and Ps-Plutarch, as it surely should be, then one wonders if the involvement of *fire* (πῦρ) that is signified by Ps-Plutarch's phrase μετὰ πυρὸς εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ἕδραμον – at least in the source-tradition on which Ps-Plutarch depends for his *Parallela Minora* 32[9] – is not somewhat different from what some would view as a *prima facie* sense in the *Parallela* – a seeming expression of a destructive intent on the part of the Roman masses. That fire should play a roll in a *poplifugium* to the shrine of Fire would hardly seem to be a matter of coincidence.

For example, with μετὰ . . . ἕδραμον, one might compare the compound verb μετατρέχω, (aorist μετέδραμον) meaning 'to run and fetch' (that is, in effect, μετὰ πῦρ ἕδραμον), as in fragment 9 of the fifth-century BC comic poet Phrynichus:

> ἀνὴρ χορεύει καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καλά.
> βούλει Διοπείθη μεταδράμω καὶ τύμπανα;
> The man dances, and things are good with the god.
> Do you want me to go and fetch Diopeithes and the drums?[10]

This Diopeithes is otherwise identified as a practitioner of the sacred, "a drummer in the Corybantic rites,"[11] as "mad," and as one of the chresmologoi.[12]

Even if a source phrase such as πῦρ μετέδραμον 'they ran to fetch fire' does not underlie Ps-Plutarch's construction μετὰ πυρὸς ἔδραμον, the sense of this latter construction may not be far removed from that of the former. The semantics of the preposition make the sense of μετὰ πυρὸς ἔδραμον more likely to be that the *populus* is running in close affiliation with Fire rather than that the mob is simply running while mechanically equipped with torches, or something of that nature. *Populus* and Fire look to accompany one another in the response to the disappearance of Romulus – a response that takes the form of a journey through space.

Could the tradition rehearsed by Ps-Plutarch have been one in which the Roman masses running to the Volcanal, sanctuary of the fire god Vulcan, are in some way conspiring with Vulcan (and an aetiological account of a ritual act)? Quite likely; though later we will encounter evidence that might lend itself to the more pernicious interpretation, one such as Ps-Plutarch seems to suggest by his juxtaposing of the "parallel" Roman and Greek traditions (see §4.4). From the synchronic perspective of Ps-Plutarch, the latter (pernicious) view might be envisioned – a reinterpretation in light of Roman historical events, as we shall see – but from a diachronic and comparative perspective, the former (fire ritual) view likely lies at the heart of the matter. In any event, we are undeniably dealing here with another account of the Roman *populus's* moving *en masse* into a defined space in conjunction with a Romulaean crisis – and in this case it is the sacred space of the Comitium and its associated Volcanal.

3.2.2 Locus Funestus; Locus Optimus

But the Volcanal is not the only architectural feature of the Comitium that the ancient sources invoke in conjunction with Romulus's departure from mortal existence. Horace's *Epode* 16, on civil war, foretells (lines 11–14) how a barbarous conqueror shall insolently scatter Romulus's bones (*ossa Quirini*) – an event that will be "*nefas* to watch" (on the Roman concepts of *fas* and *nefas*, see §§3.3 and 3.4) – bones that at the moment of the poem's composition were protected from exposure to the elements – wind and sun (*carent ventis et solibus*): in other words, Romulus's body lies moldering in a grave. In his commentary on the lines, Pomponius Porphyrio (third century AD) expounds, citing Varro: Romulus had been buried *post Rostra* 'behind the Rostra'. A scholion on the same lines that is traditionally associated with the work of Helenius Acro (second century AD) cites Varro as recording that Romulus was buried *pro Rostris* 'before the Rostra', adding that:

Plerique aiunt in Rostris Romulum sepultum esse et in memoriam huius rei leones duos ibi fuisse, sicut hodieque in sepulchris videmus, atque inde esse, ut pro Rostris mortui laudarentur . . . .

Most people say that Romulus was buried in the Rostra and as a memorialization of that, there were two [images of] lions [installed] there, just as we see today on tombs, and also for that reason the dead are eulogized before the Rostra . . . .

This orators' platform dubbed the Rostra had been constructed within the Comitium by the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century BC, and was positioned close by the Volcanal.[13]

3.2.2.1 The Niger Lapis.

In a fragmented and recondite entry, Festus (p. 177M) records that the pavement of black stone at the southern extremity of the Comitium, the structure called the Niger Lapis, marked the space of Romulus's death: *Niger lapis in Comitio locum funestum significat, ut ali, Romuli morti destinatum*. . . . – a 'polluted place'.[14] Latin *funestus* is derived from *funus*, denoting 'funeral rites'; 'corpse'; and more generally 'death, ruin'. It is a member of that family of words formed with the suffix **-nes*, "tous mots qui, comme *mūnus*, se réfèrent à une notion de caractère social".[15] The derived adjective *funestus* is used not only in the particular sense 'of death' but also serves to denote what is 'polluted, ceremonially unclean' and, in the vocabulary of omens, 'sinister'; in a remarkable Roman anthropological characterization, Tacitus provides an intriguing example of an event valued as such an omen in the early, and short-lived, career of the emperor Vitellius (*Histories* 2.91):

Apud civitatem cuncta interpretantem funesti ominis loco acceptum est quod maximum pontificatum adeptus Vitellius de caerimoniis publicis xv kalendas Augustas edixisset, anitiquitus infausto die Cremerensi Alliensique cladibus.

In a city that assigns an interpretation to everything, it was taken as a sinister omen that when Vitellius took the office of Pontifex Maximus, he issued a decree regarding public sacred rites [to be held] on July 18, a day regarded as inauspicious for ages, from the disasters of Cremera and Allia.[16]

The temporal conjunction – the shared space in the calendar of Rome – of the announced rites (*caerimoniae*) and a day considered to

be inauspicious (*infaustus*) is assigned the interpretation of an omen – one that is *funestus*.

Festus's entry on the black stone pavement (p. 177M) seems also to contain a reference to 'Faustulus, the foster-father' (*stulum nutri*) of Romulus: Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.87.2) writes of Faustulus's having been killed in an internecine battle that erupted among the people over the issue of who held divinely sanctioned hegemony, Romulus or Remus (as he suicidally inserted himself unarmed between the two warring factions), and of Faustulus's having been buried at the spot where he fell – marked by a stone lion that was set up ἐν τῷ κρατίστῳ χωρίῳ 'in the best space' of the Forum Romanum close to the Rostra.

Livy (1.12.1–3; 1.22.1) records that Hostilius – that is, Hostus or Hostius Hostilius – a comrade of Romulus's and the grandfather of Tullus Hostilius, fell in the battle fought between Romans and Sabines in the valley between the Capitoline and Palatine – the space that would become the Forum Romanum. Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 3.1.2–3) records that this Hostilius was honored with funeral rites πρὸς τῶν βασιλέων – 'at the hands of the kings' perhaps (but what kings – Romulus and Titus Tatius?); more probably, and more generalizing, 'like the kings'. Much like Faustulus, Hostilius was buried ἐν τῷ κρατίστῳ τῆς ἀγορᾶς τόπῳ 'in the best area of the Forum'.

One often encounters the idea that the burial place assigned to Faustulus and Hostus Hostilius – in the best spot in the Forum – is also to be identified with the space of the Niger Lapis; Festus's thorny passage has been restored to say as much, though the restoration is extensive and conjectural.[17] Greek κράτιστος (ἐν τῷ κρατίστῳ τῆς ἀγορᾶς τόπῳ 'in the best area of the Forum') can be used as the equivalent of Latin *clarissimus*, as in *vir clarissimus*, an honorific applied to persons of Senatorial rank; compare ἡ κρατίστη βουλή, equivalent to *clarissimus Senatus* (*Oxyrinchus Papyrus* 2108.6). The word also translates Latin *optimus* in Jupiter's cult title *Optimus Maximus Tutor*: Κράτιστος Μέγιστος Φροντιστής (*INikaia* 1141).

One wonders if the exact same cult spot could possibly be styled as both *locus funestus* – ritually polluted place – and *locus optimus* (τὸ κράτιστον χωρίον). That is, could a single locale alternate contrastively between the two characterizations? A contrastive alternation of these qualifying notions, *funestus* and *optimus*, can surely be seen in the realm of cult with regard to a single cult phenomenon – the omen. Thus, there are those omens that are *optima*: Cicero avows that *omnibus rebus optimum auspicium* 'in all things the best auspicial sign' – 'the best omen' – is *fulmen* 'lightning', *si sinistrum fuit* 'if it occurs on the left' (*De divinatione* 2.43). But in contrast, there are those omens

that are *funesta*: thus, the Umbrian Propertius, on the illness of his beloved Cynthia, writes of the song of the *nigra avis* 'black bird' (2.28.37–38):

> *Et iam Luna negat totiens descendere caelo,*
> *nigraque funestum concinit omen avis.*
> And now so oft the Moon refuses to descend from sky,
> And the black bird sings a sinister omen.[18]

But Cicero muddies – or clarifies – these waters. While Jupiter's *fulmen* 'lightning' can be designated as the *optimum auspicium*, the 'best omen' – in *all* things – there is an exception, one recorded in the ancient augural handbooks, which Cicero quotes (*Div*. 2.42–43): *Iove tonante, fulgurante comitia populi habere nefas* 'when Jupiter thunders, lightnings – to hold an assembly of the people is *nefas*' – a fundamental prohibitive notion within the realm of Roman religious practice, to which we shall soon turn (see especially §§3.3 and 3.4). *Fulmen* is thus *solum vitium* 'only unfavorable' in the matter of *comitia* 'assemblies' (*Div*. 2.43). Cicero, in the political context of the late Republic, conjectures that the doctrine was of pragmatic origin: it originated as a means for controlling the gathering of the *populus*, and the implicit popular activities. The contrastive cult opposition of *funestus* versus *optimus* here breaks down – but is not neutralized: that which is quintessentially *optimus* converts to a marker of that which is *nefas*, and does so in the spatial context (and all augury is dependent upon spatial context) of *comitium* – of a gathering of the *populus*.

3.2.2.2 The Volcanal.

The stone pavement of the Niger Lapis, walled off by white marble blocks set vertically (approximately one meter in height),[19] most probably marks the space of the archaic sanctuary of Vulcan.[20] The currently visible black marble slabs, exposed in 1899 by Giacomo Boni, belong to the first century BC; excavation beneath the stones revealed the remains of a set of monuments that are almost certainly components of the archaic Volcanal, constructed ca. 580 BC: a U-shaped altar, the lower portion of a column that may have been topped by a statue, and a mutilated *cippus* bearing an archaic inscription.[21] The *cippus* is the earliest of these elements; its inscription (CIL 1^2 1) is difficult to penetrate, owing both to its fragmentary condition and to the antiquity of its vocabulary, but clearly contains a reference to *rex* 'king' and is commonly interpreted to preserve a *lex sacra* against violation of the site[22] – a site that Festus will proclaim to be *locus funestus*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom*. 3.1.2–3) records that Hostus Hostilius, at the time of his

burial in the Forum (at an *optimus locus*), was honored with an inscribed stele testifying to his bravery; Holloway suggests that this stele is to be identified with the *cippus* beneath the Niger Lapis:[23]

> Since the *cippus* could have been examined down to the end of the Republic, this is most likely the very inscribed stone over the supposed tomb of Hostilius mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The historian's remark that the inscription named Hostilius and extolled his accomplishments shows us what the Late Republic made of the text of the inscription. It is unlikely that even the most learned men of the day could have really understood it. And this also suggests why there were so few scruples shown in cutting down and burying this and the neighboring monuments.

In Book Two, Dionysius had made reference to another inscription, this one associated not with Hostilius but with Romulus, and with his celebration of a victory over the Camerini (*Ant. Rom.* 2.54.2–3):

> . . . καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λαφύρων τέθριππον χαλκοῦν ἀνέθηκε τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀνέστησεν εἰκόνα ἐπιγράψας Ἑλληνικοῖς γράμμασι τὰς ἑαυτοῦ πράξεις.
>
> . . . and from the spoils he dedicated a bronze four-horse chariot to Vulcan and near it he set up his own image, on which he had inscribed an account of his deeds in Greek letters.

It is this inscription, in Cornell's view,[24] that should likely be identified with that of the *cippus* beneath the Niger Lapis, within the monumental remains of the Volcanal.

3.2.3 The Sanctuary of Vulcan in Campo

Vulcan has a second cult space associated with Romulus. Plutarch's *Quaestiones Romanae* 47 poses the query:

> Διὰ τί τὸ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου ἱερὸν ἔξω πόλεως ὁ Ῥωμύλος ἱδρύσατο;
> Why did Romulus found the temple of Vulcan outside of the city?

The second of three potential answers that Plutarch entertains – one that by his seeming dismissal of its causality as foolishness he confirms in its currency – is of significant, if slightly oblique, relevance to the matter of the Poplifugia (to which point we shall return shortly [see §3.3] as well as to the matter of the underlined

form in the following passage):

> Ἢ τοῦτο μὲν ἀβέλτερον, ᾠκοδομήθη δ' ὁ ναὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς συνέδριον καὶ βουλευτήριον ἀπόρρητον αὐτῷ μετὰ Τατίου τοῦ συμβασιλεύσαντος, ὅπως συνιόντες ἐνταῦθα μετὰ τῶν γερόντων ἄνευ τοῦ παρενοχλεῖσθαι καθ' ἡσυχίαν βουλεύοιντο περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων;
>
> Or is this silly – was the temple from the beginning built for him [i.e. Romulus] and for his co-regent Tatius as a "secret" meeting-place and council chamber, so that they might meet there quietly, without being annoyed, and deliberate with the Senators concerning affairs?

This *aedes Volcani* 'temple of Vulcan' was located in the Campus Martius (Livy 24.10.9) – the space – or rather, the other space – of the disappearance of Romulus. Vitruvius 1.7.1 discusses the necessity of placing the temple outside of the city walls, owing to the menacing potentialities of Vulcan's fire: the line of demarcation that is operative here, however, is certainly most immediately the sacred boundary of the *pomerium*[25] (see §4.3.2, for further discussion). The entry for the Volcanalia, festival of Vulcan on August 23, in the *Fasti Vallenses* (CIL I^2 240) notes that Vulcan is celebrated in the Circus Flaminius (*Volcano in Circo Flaminio*). Located in the southern aspect of the Campus Martius, the Circus Flaminius was constructed in 220 BC by C. Flaminius Nepos. The temple of Vulcan was perhaps located just to the north of the area of the Circus, within the space that would later be occupied by the Crypta of Balbus. The Severan Marble Plan (*Forma Urbis Romae*; ca. early third century AD) depicts a small structure roughly in the center of the area of the Crypta that may signal Vulcan's temple, in light of the close-by discovery of an inscription recording a dedication to the fire deity.[26]

No less than the Volcanal with its affiliated space of the Comitium, this temple of Vulcan in the Campus Martius also co-ordinates spatially with *comitia* – the *comitia centuriata*. In Roman mythic-historic tradition, the *comitia centuriata* are the creation of the middle Tarquin king, Servius Tullius, though many twentieth-century scholars considered their inception to be rather later than this sixth-century BC figure; but as Cornell argues, the traditional view is not encumbered by the various problems that arise from the reinterpretative view: "These problems disappear . . . if we accept that the centuriate assembly was created by Servius Tullius precisely in order to reduce the influence of the patricians, and that it already existed as a functioning institution at the end of the monarchy."[27] Nicolet paints the profile of the *comitia centuriata* in this way:[28]

> The *comitia centuriata* were assemblies of the whole people, patricians and plebeians, divided . . . into property-classes and voting units within the classes known as centuries. . . . This classification had an obvious military purpose: the census classes were also classes of warriors whose equipment, and hence their role in battle, depended on their census rating.

Reflecting this military structure, the assembly place of the *comitia centuriata* was the Campus Martius;[29] Aulus Gellius, citing one Laelius Felix, (*NA* 15.27.5) sets out the rationale:

> *Centuriata autem comitia intra pomerium fieri nefas esse, quia exercitum extra urbem imperari oporteat, intra urbem imperari ius non sit. Proptera centuriata in Campo Martio haberi . . . solitum . . . .*
>
> But for the *comitia centuriata* to be held within the *pomerium* is *nefas*, because the military horde must be assembled outside of the city: it is not *ius* to assemble it within the city. And so, it is the custom for the *centuriata* to be held in the Campus Martius . . . .[30]

It is *nefas* for the *comitia centuriata* to gather within the perimeter of the sacred urban boundary of the *pomerium*. We again encounter the notion of *nefas* in conjunction with *comitia*: *nefas* is a fundamental notion of Roman religion to which we turn next. Latin *ius esse* is often translated 'it is lawful', but the semantics of the archaic concept of *ius* are much more intricate than such a translation would suggest. This archaic legal notion is a fundamentally linguistic, or enunciative, one; Benveniste's remarks (which follow upon comparisons with the Vedic and Avestan cognates of *ius*, *yoḫ*, and *yaoš* respectively) provide helpful insight:[31]

> Le mot indo-européen **yous* signifie "l'état de régularité, de normalité qui est requis par des règles rituelles". . . .
>
> On est fondé à considérer que *ius*, en général, est bien une *formule* et non pas un concept abstrait: *iura* est le recueil des sentences de droit.

This fundamental linguistic/enunciative character of religious and legal notions that lie close to the heart of the phenomena herein examined will continue to present themselves.

3.3 Language of the Forbidden: Part 1

Given the characterization of the space of the Volcanal in the Comitium as *locus funestus*, the adjective that Plutarch (*Quaest. Rom.* 47) uses to describe Vulcan's temple *in Campo* is intriguing: that locale, writes Plutarch, is one that is ἀπόρρητος, the term that was translated earlier on the first pass as 'secret'. The adjective ἀπόρρητος is derived from the verb ἀπερώ, which synchronically forms part of the highly suppletive paradigm of the verb lexically catalogued as ἀπεῖπον. In Homeric Epic, ἀποεῖπον denotes 'to deny, refuse, renounce' but also 'to declare', and is so used of the speech act of pronouncing a μῦθος at *Iliad* 9.309[32] and *Odyssey* 1.373. The verb set occurs frequently in post-Epic with the sense 'to forbid' (with or without a negative particle), as in the final lines of Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*: the daughters of Oedipus ask Theseus to lead them to the tomb of their father; his response (line 1758) is that for them to go there would be οὐ θεμιτόν 'not divinely sanctioned' (on which phrase, see §3.3.2). In lines 1760 and following he elaborates on why a journey to that space would be οὐ θεμιτόν:

ὦ παῖδες, ἀπεῖπεν ἐμοὶ κεῖνος 1760
μήτε πελάζειν ἐς τούσδε τόπους
μήτ' ἐπιφωνεῖν μηδένα θνητῶν
θήκην ἱεράν, ἣν κεῖνος ἔχει.
O daughters, that man forbade me 1760
to approach those places
and to declare to any of mortals
the sacred grave, which that man possesses.

And in Sophocles' *Antigone*, the guard says to Creon (lines 404–405): ταύτην γ' ἰδὼν θάπτουσαν ὅν σὺ τὸν νεκρὸν | ἀπεῖπας 'I saw her performing the funeral rites that you forbade to the body'.

The participle τὸ ἀπειρημένον denotes 'the forbidden thing'. Thus, Plutarch in his *Life of Pompey* writes of the Mamertine response to Pompey's incursion into Sicily and of Pompey's reaction (10.2–3):

παραιτουμένων γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸ βῆμα καὶ τὴν δικαιοδοσίαν ὡς νόμῳ παλαιῷ Ῥωμαίων ἀπειρημένα, "Οὐ παύσεσθε," εἶπεν, "ἡμῖν ὑπεζωσμένοις ξίφη νόμους ἀναγινώσκοντες;"

For since they were trying to evade his tribunal and jurisdiction as things forbidden by an ancient law of the Romans, he said, "Why don't you stop reading laws to us who are belted with swords?"

In his *Quaestiones Romanae* 6, Plutarch refers to the drinking of wine by women as ἀπειρημένον 'a thing forbidden'. In his *Roman History*, Cassius Dio refers to murderers and ἱερόσυλοι 'temple-robbers' (i.e., persons guilty of sacrilege) as those who have engaged in ἀπειρημένα 'things forbidden' (56.4.6).

The usage of the adjectival form ἀπόρρητος that we find in Plutarch's description of the temple of Vulcan in *Quaestiones Romanae* 47 is archaic: such a sense of the term is attributed to the seventh-century sage Periander, tyrant of Corinth (ἀπορρήτων ἐκφορὰς μὴ ποιοῦ 'Do not give utterance to forbidden things'; Diogenes Laertius 1.98), as well as to the Spartan Chilon a century later (τί δύσκολον, τὸ τὰ ἀπόρρητα σιωπῆσαι 'What is difficult [to do]? To keep silent about things forbidden'; Diogenes Laertius 1.69). And in his *Life of Nicias*, Plutarch himself reports that the pre-Socratic philosopher Anaxagoras (fifth–sixth century BC) was the first to write with great clarity about lunar phases, but that his ideas were slow to be accepted, and that Anaxagoras would be imprisoned for diluting the divine element in natural phenomena: what Anaxagoras wrote was not ὁ λόγος ἔνδοξος 'the accepted, *popular* notion' but, in contrast, was ὁ λόγος ἀπόρρητος 'the *forbidden* notion'. Nuances of 'forbidden' are fundamental to the derived adjective ἀπόρρητος, and within the immediate semantic range of its componential denotation 'denied, renounced'; the semantic shift to 'not to be spoken, secret' is a short one, though it makes a curious adjectival match for a verb paradigm that can signal an enunciative act. The adjective is often used of the secrets of the sacred, of the μυστήρια 'mysteries': "Secrecy was radical, though it remained an open question whether in mysteries the sacred was forbidden, *apporrheton* [ἀπόρρητον], or unspeakable, *arrheton* in an absolute sense," observes Burkert.[33]

3.3.1 Consus and Tutulina

One finds instances of ἀπόρρητος used in conjunction with notions of 'taking counsel' aside from that of *Quaestiones Romanae* 47 (see §3.2.3). Thus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 2.30.3) describes the vow that Romulus made before his attempted, and successful, abduction of the Sabine virgins (ἡ ἁρπαγὴ παρθένων): the vow was made θεῷ . . . ἀπορρήτων βουλευμάτων ἡγεμόνι 'to the god . . . chief of secret counsels' – that is, to Consus, the grain god whom we saw to receive a sacrifice on the Nones of July (the Nonae Caprotinae) as a part of the nexus of fertility that aggregates on that day (see §1.4.1). Plutarch elaborates (*Rom.* 14.3–4). In setting the stage for the abduction, a report was circulated that Romulus had discovered a subterranean altar: it was that of the god they called Consus, either

being a θεὸς βουλαῖος ‘god of counsel’ – Plutarch invokes Latin *consilium* ‘deliberation, counsel’ as an etymon – or a ἵππιος Ποσειδῶν ‘Neptune of horses’ – the altar was located in the space that would become the Circus Maximus. Plutarch then adds that an underground altar is appropriate for a god of counsel τοῦ βουλεύματος ἀπορρήτου καὶ ἀφανοῦς ‘since counsel is secret and unseen’: the conjunction of ἀπόρρητος with ἀφανής ‘unseen’ clearly suggests that the nuance of ἀπόρρητος is here ‘not to be declared, not be repeated’; thus counsel, in other words, should be ‘*unheard* and unseen’. There is some audience to whom the whole business is off-limits.

The ancient etymology linking the name of Consus with Latin *consilium* is of course a pseudo-etymology: Consus is an agrarian deity, the god of stored grain, and for an etymon one should look rather to *condere* ‘to store up, to bury’.[34] This etymological righting does not of course require that the chthonian Consus have no affiliation with τὰ ἀπόρρητα. Pliny (*HN* 18.8) indicates that images of three agrarian goddesses stood in the Circus Maximus: Seia (associated with sowing of grain), Segesta (or Segetia, affiliated with harvesting the standing grain), and a third, whose name it is taboo to mention *sub tecto* ‘indoors’. Comparison with Augustine’s remarks on these goddesses suggests that she of the ineffable name is Tutulina, who, much like Consus, protects the stored grain (*De civitate Dei* 4.8; cf. Tertullian *De spect.* 8 and see §9.5.2). And Dionysius of Halicarnassus has more to say regarding the identity of the god worshipped at the subterranean altar in the Circus (*Ant. Rom.* 2.31.3): he knows a tradition that holds that the altar was erected δαίμονι ἀρρήτῳ τινὶ βουλευμάτων κρυφίων ἡγεμόνι καὶ φύλακι ‘to a certain deity *whose name is not to be spoken* (ἄρρητος [from the simplex form that provides ἀπόρρητος]), chief and guardian of hidden counsels’.

3.3.2 Numa Pompilius

Romulus’s royal successor, the Sabine Numa Pompilius, was renowned for his virtue and wisdom: Plutarch describes him as ἄμεμπτος δικαστὴς καὶ σύμβουλος ‘blameless judge and counselor’ (*Numa* 3.6). Prior to assuming the throne, Numa had chosen for himself a largely extramural existence, ἐκλείπων τὰς ἐν ἄστει διατριβάς ‘forsaking a city lifestyle’, wandering alone, living his life in remote spaces, ἐν ἄλσεσι θεῶν καὶ λειμῶσιν ἱεροῖς καὶ τόποις ἐρήμοις ‘in groves of the gods and sacred meadows and solitary places’ (*Numa* 4.1). In these spaces in which Numa set himself apart from the city and its people, it was said that the divine Egeria loved and consorted with him, and that she was the source of his remarkable wisdom (*Numa* 4.1–2). Plutarch describes her ‘cohabitation’ (συνουσία) with Numa in these remote spaces as

ἀπόρρητος (*Numa* 8.6): surely something other than a mere tryst is intended. Their relationship is lived out unobserved by the *populus*, beyond the boundary of society.

Echoing this divide – and refocusing our attention on the fundamental sense of 'forbidden' – the notion of ἀπόρρητος is bound up not only with activities of the temple of the devouring flame of Vulcan in the Campus, but also with the temple of the anchoring flame of Vesta in the Forum. Dionysius of Halicarnassus records (*Ant. Rom.* 2.66.2–3) that there is uncertainty about what is preserved in the temple of Vesta. Some say that the only thing that the Vestals keep watch over there is the φανερὸν πῦρ 'visible fire' – the *conspicuous* feature of the temple of which all would have knowledge; but in contrast:

> εἰσὶ δέ τινες οἵ φασιν ἔξω τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπόρρητα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἱερὰ κεῖσθαί τινα ἐν τῷ τεμένει τῆς θεᾶς, ὧν οἵ τε ἱεροφάνται τὴν γνῶσιν ἔχουσι καὶ αἱ παρθένοι, ...
>
> There are some who say that aside from the fire certain sacred things lie within the sanctuary of the goddess that are forbidden to the masses, of which the Pontifices and the Vestal Virgins have knowledge, ...

Dionysius's own opinion is that there are indeed such sacred objects protected by the Virgins, and which are τοῖς πολλοῖς ἄδηλα 'imperceptible to the masses' (*Ant. Rom.* 2.66.6). What is ἀπόρρητος 'forbidden' is ἄδηλος 'imperceptible'.

Plutarch (*Numa* 14.3) judges that many of the παραγγέλματα 'precepts' of Numa were similar to those of the Pythagoreans. To make the point, he rehearses several Pythagorean instructions, appending the observation that the intent of each of these παραγγέλματα 'precepts' was something that ἀπεκρύπτοντο πρὸς τοὺς πολλούς 'they used to keep hidden from the masses'. He then makes the comparison with Numa's teachings, beginning with the summary introduction: οὕτως ἔνια τῶν Νομᾶ πατρίων ἀπόρρητον ἔχει τὸν λόγον 'thus some of Numa's ancient customs have a basis that is off-limits'. The adjective ἀπόρρητος again signals a distancing from the *populus*.

When Numa died, writes Plutarch (*Numa* 22.2), two stone coffins were crafted for his burial beneath the Janiculum. Per Numa's instructions, his body was interred in one, and in the other the sacred books that he had written. Why the books? Plutarch continues: while Numa was alive he had thoroughly instructed the priests in the 'things

written' (γεγραμμένα), but judged that οὐ καλῶς ἐν ἀψύχοις γράμμασι φρουρουμένων τῶν ἀπορρήτων 'it would be a mistake for things forbidden to be left in the guardianship of lifeless letters'. Numa's sacred books are the repository of ἀπόρρητα and so must be made inaccessible – imperceptible.

Off-limits and buried though the books be, this is not the end of the story (*Numa* 22.4–5). "Some four hundred years later" (181 BC), in the consulship of Publicus Cornelius and Marcus Baebius, a geological slide following a torrential rain exposed the coffins:[35] Numa's own was found to be completely empty; the γράμματα 'writings' were recovered from the other.[36] Q. Petilius, then Praetor Urbanus, read Numa's writings and carried them to the Senate, μὴ δοκεῖν αὐτῷ θεμιτὸν εἶναι λέγων μηδὲ ὅσιον ἔκπυστα πολλοῖς τὰ γεγραμμένα γενέσθαι 'saying that it seemed to him not to be divinely sanctioned and also to be impious for the writings to be found out by the masses': that which is not to be spoken, it is deemed, is also not to be written.

To prevent the *populus* from gaining knowledge of the γεγραμμένα 'things written', the books were carried to the sacred space of the Comitium and there they were incinerated. Livy (40.29.14) reports that they were burned *in conspectu populi* 'in the view of the *populus*', as if to drive home the divide separating the ἀπόρρητα from the masses. The incineration of the sacred books, Plutarch adds, was carried out by the Victimarii, cult specialists in the immolation and dissection of sacrificial animals: "ils étaient généralement de statut servile (Val. Max. 9, 14[37]), ou affranchi, notamment dans le cadre de l'armée."[38] The ἀπόρρητα of the pious king Numa are "sacrificed" by cult personnel who are conspicuously associated with the masses and the military.

Numa's ἀπόρρητα 'things forbidden' were pronounced by the Praetor Urbanus μὴ θεμιτὸν εἶναι 'not to be divinely sanctioned', as regards exposure to the masses. This is not the first time we have encountered this lexical confluence: at the outset of this discussion of ἀπόρρητος (§3.3), it was noted that in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, Theseus declares that Oedipus ἀπεῖπεν 'forbade' him to approach the space of Oedipus's grave or to make known its location (lines 1760–1764) – to enter that space, and so violate the thing forbidden, is οὐ θεμιτόν 'not divinely sanctioned' (line 1758). Greek θεμιτός and its morphological biform θεμιστός are adjectival expressions of the nominal θέμις; the phrase οὐ θεμιτόν is equivalent to οὐ θέμις (*LSJ* 789).[39]

In the context of Roman cultural translations, as in Plutarch's account of Numa's ἀπόρρητα 'things forbidden', the conveyance of which to the masses is οὐ θεμιτόν, the sense of Greek θέμις is

fundamentally that of Latin *fas*. The Latin term denotes 'what is divinely sanctioned' and, thus, 'what is permissible'.[40] This is one of those instances in which the frailty of the translator's art becomes especially palpable: the English equivalents seem anemic relative to the import of the concept conveyed by the term in Roman cultural context. Etymologically, *fas* shares a common origin with *fari* 'to speak', as Benveniste and others have argued; and *fas* can only be rightly understood by referencing its essential linguistic, enunciative character. Regarding the "equation" of Greek θέμις and Latin *fas*, Ausonius (*Technopaegnion* 8) writes: *Prima deum Fas quae Themis est Graiis* 'first among the gods was *Fas* who is *Themis* to the Greeks'. Similarly, Festus (p. 367M) records:

> *Themin deam putabant esse, quae praeciperet hominibus id petere, quod fas esset, eamque id esse existimabant, quod et fas est.*
>
> They considered Themis to be a goddess who teaches men to seek after what is *fas*, and they judged her to be what is *fas*.

Though perhaps he puts a bit too fine a derivational-morphological point on it, Phillipson was right on track in his summary observation of a century ago: "*Fas* corresponds to the Greek θέμις, hence *fastus* to θέμιστος, and *nefas* to οὐ θέμις; so that the Latin 'fas est' is equivalent to the Greek θέμις ἐστί . . . ."[41]

3.4 Days of the Forbidden

Numa's ἀπόρρητα are 'off-limits' to the masses: they are beyond the bounds. For a written – as for an oral – account of those ἀπόρρητα to be disseminated among the *populus* would be *nefas* – a term denoting 'what is forbidden',[42] 'péché contre la religion',[43] 'a monstrous (almost unspeakable) act'[44] – as apposed to what is *fas*. This is undoubtedly the Roman sentiment lying behind Plutarch's Greek phrasing of the enunciation of the Praetor Urbanus: μὴ δοκεῖν αυτῷ θεμιτὸν εἶναι 'it seemed to him not to be divinely sanctioned' – that is, 'to be *nefastus*', the adjectival derivative of *nefas*, as *fastus* is of *fas*. The Praetor Urbanus is the magistrate whose own enunciations are regularly proscribed or permitted by the calendrical characterization of days as either *nefastus* or *fastus*, respectively: Varro explains, revealing the conjunctions of *fari* and *(ne)fastus* (*Ling.* 6.29–30; the translation is that of Bettini[45] [underlines are my own]):[46]

> *Dies fasti, per quos praetoribus omnia verba sine piaculo licet fari . . . contrarii horum vocantur dies nefasti, per quos dies nefas fari*

praetorem "do, dico, addico." Itaque non potest agi: necesse est aliquo eorum uti verbo, cum lege quid peragitur.

> Those days on which the praetors are authorized to pronounce any words without committing impieties are called *dies fasti*. The opposite of these are called *dies nefasti*, when the praetor is forbidden to pronounce the words "I allow, I affirm, I assent." So there is no possibility of conducting any business, since it is necessary to use one of these expressions when some question of the law is being dealt with.

"What Varro apparently means is that the *dies fasti* are so called because it was on those days that the praetor had the opportunity to *fari* ('to pronounce') certain words," notes Bettini.[47] Pointing out that Varro (*Ling* 6.53) describes the words of the Praetor as *certa verba legitima* 'sure words with legal force (which, in addition, Varro records, the Praetor *sine piaculo . . . licet fari* 'is permitted to speak . . . without sin' on *dies fasti*), Bettini then offers the very important observation:[48]

> Endowed with this power, the magistrate's words do not belong to the sphere of *dicere* or of *loqui* but to that of *fari*, and as such, the praetor's *certa verba legitima* have to be bound to the prescriptions of the religious calendar. Since it does not consist of just any old words (the Roman calendar hardly concerns itself with everyday chitchat), the praetor's mode of speech – *fari* – can be exercised on some days, while on certain other days it is expressly prohibited.

In addition to those days that are *fasti* and those that are *nefasti*, there is also a type of day that is declared to be *endotercisus*, a 'cut day'. Such a day both begins and ends *nefastus*, but in between *est fas*. The crucial transformation is effected by the performance of sacred acts: the day becomes *fastus* with the immolation of a sacrificial victim and ceases to be so when the victim's entrails are offered (Varro *Ling*. 6.31; cf. Macrobius *Sat*. 1.16.2–3).

There are in addition three days in the Roman year that are *dies fissi* 'split days': each begins as *nefastus* and ends as *fastus*. Two of these days, March 24 and May 24, are marked in the calendar as Q.R.C.F. (*Fasti Antiates maiores, Vaticani*, and *Caeretani*) or Q.REX.C.F. (*Fasti Praenestini* and *Maffeiani*). Varro (*Ling*. 6.31) reveals that the abbreviation stands for *Quando Rex Comitiavit Fas* 'when the *rex comitiavit* it is *fas*':

Dies qui vocatur sic Quando Rex Comitiavit Fas, *is dictus ab eo quod eo die rex sacrificio ius dicat ad Comitium, ad quod tempus est nefas, ab eo fas: itaque post id tempus lege actum saepe*.

The day that is called *Quando Rex Comitiavit Fas* is so named because on this day the *rex* pronounces the formula for sacrifice in the Comitium, prior to which time it is *nefas*, and after which it is *fas*: thus subsequent to this time legal action is common.

The meaning of the verb *comitiare* is uncertain but seems clearly to denote (or entail) some sacred enunciative act performed by the Rex Sacrorum. Commenting on the abbreviation, Paulus (Festus p. 259M) writes: *quando rex sacrificulus divinis rebus perfectis in Comitium venit* 'when the Rex Sacrificulus [= Sacrorum] comes into the Comitium, with the rites completed'. The third of these *dies fissi* occurs on June 15, marked in the calendar with the abbreviation Q.S.D.F. (*Fasti Tusculani*) or Q.ST.D.F. (*Fasti Antiates maiores*, *Venusini* and *Maffeiani*) – that is *Quando Stercum Delatum Fas* 'when the dung has been carried down it is *fas*' (Varro *Ling.* 6.32).[49] "Dung" refers to the refuse from the temple of Vesta, which receives its annual cleaning on this day. The day begins *nefastus*; with the removal and the depositing of the refuse along the Clivus Capitolinus, time becomes *fastus*.

The opposition *fas/nefas* toggles between time. On this day, at this moment, time is *fastus*. But now, on this day, at this moment, time is *nefastus*.

3.5 Language of the Forbidden: Part 2

Confirmatory evidence of the Roman signification of Plutarch's Greek phrasing, μὴ δοκεῖν αυτῷ θεμιτὸν εἶναι, is provided by Augustine's polemical words on the episode of the discovery of Numa's books (*De. civ. D.* 7.34) – words that ultimately find their source and inspiration in Varro's treatment of the event, no less so than the lines that Augustine attributes verbatim to Varro's *Curio de cultu deorum*.[50] Teaching the ἀπόρρητα 'things forbidden' would have been *nefas*: Numa thus buried his books, lest (per Augustine and Varro) he should inform (*docere*) the people (*homines*)[51] of *nefaria* – another adjectival derivative of *nefas* (i.e., *nefarius*, etc.), denoting 'characterized by *nefas*', hence 'impious, vile [things]'. The ἀπόρρητα of Numa would be *nefaria* for the masses.

But there is more: Augustine further writes that the Senate decided rather than to rebury Numa's books – records of the *sacrorum causae* 'origins of the sacred rites' – to consign those works – which

Augustine, following his informer Varro, identifies as *nefanda monumenta* – to the flames, lest by knowledge of them, *civitas turbaretur* 'the body of the citizenry should be thrown into chaos'. Firsthand exposure to the *sacrorum causae*, ἀπόρρητα of Numa, would have as an immediate consequence the traumatic disruption of the *populus*.

The ἀπόρρητα preserved within the books of Numa thus render them *nefanda monumenta*. The adjective *nefandus*, commonly translated into English as 'impious; abominable', is the negative correlative of *fandus*, gerundive of the verb *fari*: *fandus* denotes 'that may be spoken of or said' (*OLD*), or, as Bettini renders it, "that of which people have 'heard tell'"[52] – we might also say that *fandus* denotes 'that which people ought to hear'. In contrast, the negative *nefandus* (and *infandus*) "is simultaneously that which is 'unspeakable' and 'the like of which you have never heard tell';"[53] in other words, *nefandus* denotes 'that which people ought not to hear'. Numa's books are records of verbal expressions that the *populus* have no business hearing – of words that are off-limits, out-of-bounds, to the masses.

Livy conjoins the two adjectives (*nefandus* and *fandus*), negative and positive, as they not uncommonly are, in his description of what it was that prevented embattled Samnite warriors from fleeing before the Roman army during the battle of Aquilonia (293 BC). The Samnites had enacted a new law drafting all men of military age; whoever failed to respond – *eius caput Iovi sacraretur* 'his head was made sacred (i.e., forfeited) to Jupiter' (Livy 10.38.3–4). The commissioned warrior troop, 40,000 in number, encamped at Aquilonia; and within the camp, writes Livy (10.38.5–11), a sacred space was marked off, bounded by wicker screens and covered over with linen. Sacrifices were there offered, as read from an ancient linen book; a certain venerable priest, one Ovius Paccius, conducted rites said to be of archaic Samnite practice. The most noble soldiers, by birth and by deeds, were brought individually into the enclosed space, dotted with altars and sacrificed victims, surrounded by ritual officiants[54] armed with swords: at the altars each man was sworn not to make known either what was seen or what was heard in that space and each took an oath *diro quodam carmine* 'with a certain terrible formula' to forfeit his own life and that of his family if he did not follow his commanders into battle, or if he fled, or, if seeing a comrade fleeing, he did not kill that one immediately. There were at first those who refused to utter the prescribed enunciation; these were slaughtered at the altars, and their bodies fell among the carcasses of the sacrificial animals.

And so the Samnite warriors would not take flight at the eventual Roman attack (Livy 10.41.1–4). They were held in place by a vision of

the rites, says Livy – the presence of the armed priests, the oath placed upon them, and the sight of gore staining the fixtures of the sacred – *promiscua hominum pecudumque strages et respersae fando nefandoque sanguine arae* 'the slaughter of men and beasts mixed and the blood, *fandus and nefandus*, of the splattered altars'. The blood that stains the altars is both *fandus* – that of sacrificial animals offered in accordance with ancient Samnite practice – and *nefandus* – that of the warriors killed within the sacred space of the camp for refusing to speak the oath that would bind them to battle.

In this literary instance there is a salient collaboration of verbal act and lexeme. As a consequence of their refusing to *enunciate* the oath (*iurare*), the blood of the offending warriors is spilled – and that blood is *nefandus* – an expression of an impious silence in the face of a compulsion to utter sacred words – binding speech elicited within a dedicated, sacred space. This is, literally, blood that is 'not to be spoken', that 'ought not to be heard of'. In contrast, the blood of the sacrificial victims is *fandus*. It is blood spilled in conjunction with the uttering of the appropriate sacred formulae: it is blood that is 'to be spoken', blood that 'ought to be heard of'.[55] The one, ritual slaying (*fandus*), an everyday practice, is commonly known to the masses; the other (*nefandus*) is verbally off-limits to the masses – as Livy (10.38.9) tells his readers, each man was sworn not to make known 'what was seen and *heard* in that space' (*quae visa auditaque in eo loco*).

We saw at the outset of our discussion that Greek ἀπόρρητος too belongs fundamentally to the realm of linguistic action, being derived from the verb ἀπ-ερῶ ('to deny'; 'to forbid'; and also 'to declare'): ἀπ-ερῶ is a compounded form of the simplex verb εἴρω 'to say, speak'; 'to declare' (from earlier *ϝερ-yω). The word is deeply archaic, of Indo-European origin – a reflex of the root *werh$_1$- / *wreh$_1$- 'to say':[56] compare Avestan *urvāta-* 'command, law', linguistically equivalent to Greek ῥητόν 'that which may be spoken', as opposed to ἄρρητον 'that which may not be spoken' (the simplex form of ἀπόρρητος noted earlier; consider Sophocles *Oedipus at Colonus* 1001, where the two are conjoined modifiers of ἔπος 'word', i.e., ῥητὸν ἄρρητόν τ' ἔπος). Other Indo-European congeners include Sanskrit *vratá-* 'command; religious vow', Latin *verbum* 'word', Gothic *waurd* 'word'. Two more examples of the usage of ἀπόρρητος in linguistically salient ways follow, briefly considered.

In *Life of Numa* (10.7), Plutarch describes the execution rite of the Vestal whose virginity has been compromised – a procession through the Forum marked by profound silence, with the Vestal being carried

on a litter and muffled by heavy coverings bound tight. The procession terminates with the Pontifex Maximus raising his hands towards the gods and εὐχάς τινας ἀπορρήτους ποιησάμενος 'making certain . . . prayers' – prayers that are ἀπόρρητος (off-limits to any but the gods) – and placing the veiled Vestal onto a ladder that leads down into her tomb; as she descends, the Pontifex Maximus, along with the other priests present, averts his face. The rite is unmistakably characterized by elements of the unseen and the unheard.[57]

At *Historia* 44, Lucian describes the sort of language one should use to write history. The historical author should write clearly μήτε ἀπορρήτοις καὶ ἔξω πάτου ὀνόμασι μήτε τοῖς ἀγοραίοις τούτοις καὶ καπηλικοῖς 'and not with words that are off-limits and out-of-the-way, and not with the vulgarities of the markets and of hawkers'. Instead, the historical writer should use words that are intelligible *to the masses* (τοῦς πολλούς) and commendable (ἐπαινέσαι) to the educated. Language that is ἀπόρρητος is language that is to be avoided – forbidden language – in communicating with the masses, as vulgarities are *mal à propos* for the educated audience. Isocrates (*In Lochitem* 3) alludes to a law imposing a fine of 500 drachmas on those using language that is forbidden, τοὺς λέγοντάς τι τῶν ἀπορρήτων 'those speaking any of the off-limits [words]'.[58]

3.6 Some Conclusions

There is an alternative to the apotheosis tradition of Romulus's disappearance: he has been murdered. The murder is set in the vicinity of urban Rome, at the shrine of Vulcan along the perimeter of the Comitium. The crisis of the disappearing warrior-king incites panic among the *populus Romanus*. This panic takes the expression of a movement of the *populus en masse* through space, into the area of the Volcanal and Comitium, place of the assembled Senators – a movement that is in some way conducted in association with fire – or Fire (i.e., Vulcan). The space of Vulcan's shrine can be designated as *locus funestus* – but also as *locus optimus*: the characterization of the Volcanal can toggle between the two – an alternation otherwise observed within the realm of Roman cult as an alternation between *nefas* and *optimus*. Vulcan also possesses a temple in the Campus Martius, a space that can be characterized as ἀπόρρητος. Both Latin *nefas*, with its adjectival derivative *nefastus*, and Greek ἀπόρρητος, have notions of speech production at their core – more specifically, prohibition with regard to such. Latin *nefandus*, sharing a common derivation with *nefas* (from *fari*), and Greek ἀπόρρητος both denote that which is 'not to be spoken', hence 'not to be heard' – that which is off-limits to a certain entity: violation of those limits is οὐ θεμιτός,

the Greek equivalent of Latin *nefastus*. Both the Volcanal *in Comitio* and *aedes Volcani in Campo* are spaces that are – or can be – off-limits. The former, the Volcanal (*locus funestus*), is marked by the walled-off, black-stoned Niger Lapis; popular intrusion into the space of the Volcanal can be *nefas*: "can be," as the very same space can be styled as the place ἔνθα ἦν ἔθος αὐτοῖς τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιτελεῖν 'where the people would hold their assemblies', as Dionysius of Halicarnassus has told us (*Ant. Rom.* 6.67.2). The latter, Vulcan's shrine in the Campus Martius, is designated a space ἀπόρρητος – a place in which Romulus and Titus Tatius could meet to deliberate with the Senate – a space in which they can gather ἄνευ τοῦ παρενοχλεῖσθαι 'without being annoyed', writes Plutarch (*Quaest. Rom.* 47): that is, without experiencing παρεν-όχλησις 'annoyance' – without being inundated by ὁ ὄχλος, the 'throng' – the *populus*.

The parallels between the two sets of Vulcan's co-ordinates are unmistakable. Both temples are situated in locales from which Romulus is said to have departed Rome and his earthly existence. Both of those locales, Comitium and Campus Martius, provide a space for *en masse* movement of the *populus Romanus* consequent to the Romulaean crisis (i.e., for a *poplifugium*). Both of Vulcan's temples can bear the status of space off-limits. Both temples are situated on sites that provide the assembly place for *comitia*. Those sites are each marked by their own warrior affiliation: the Volcanal is the burial site of Faustulus, who fell suicidally in the fight between Romulaean and Remorian factions, and of Hostus Hostilius, a warrior slain in the Forum battle between the Roman and Sabine armies, the latter with a name that paints him as manifestly foreign (Latin *hostis* 'foreign, stranger; enemy'); the *aedes Volcani in Campo* is situated within the space of the warrior god, the space of the gathering of the army – which is not permitted within the city.

[1] I have here slightly modified Robertson's typography: Robertson identifies Ps-Plutarch by a bracketing convention, that is, as [Plutarch].

[2] Robertson 1987:11n5. Robertson here joins in with those who have disparaged many of Ps-Plutarch's cited sources; see Chapter 1, note 11.

[3] Robertson 1987:11.

[4] Nicolet 1988:247.

[5] With regard to these passages, Lilly Ross Taylor (1990:119n16) writes: "The Volcanal seems to be the site of *comitia* [6.67.2 and 11.39.1] as well as *contio* in 7.17". . . "The *contio*, the unsorted public meeting at which the magistrate informed the people of questions to be asked in the *comitia* . . ., was summoned for many other purposes besides the voting assemblies for which it was an essential preliminary" (p. 15).

[6] See Coarelli 2007:55–57.

[7] See Dumézil 1996:312–326; 1954:27–43.

[8] See Woodard 2006:82–83; 152–155.

[9] As noted earlier, Ps-Plutarch credits one Aristobulus as his immediate source for this account, citing the third book of his Italian history: "Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec*. 4, 328 (= F. Jacoby, *Fr. Gr. Hist*. 3 C, 830, 1). Sur cet historien, voir Knaack, *RE* Suppl. I, c. 133, *Aristobulus* n° 14/a," writes Boulogne (2002:440n215).

[10] On the fragment, see Scullion 2002:120, with references to previous work (120n53).

[11] See Guthrie 2000:228n3.

[12] See Parker 2005:92 [especially note 11]; Flower 2008:124–125.

[13] See Coarelli 2007:53, 56.

[14] On the sense of Festus's entry, Cornell remarks, offering a corrective: "The best I can do is 'indicates a deathly place, intended for the death of Romulus' (not 'for the dead body of Romulus') as some scholars seem to understand it. In Latin that would be *Romulo mortuo*, not *Romuli morti*."

[15] Benveniste 1969:1:96.

[16] On these Roman military disasters, see Livy 6.1.11: on July 18, the Veientines ambushed and slaughtered the Fabii by the river Cremera (477 BC), and the Gauls defeated the Romans along the Allia (390 BC; cf. Plutarch *Cam*. 19.1; *Quaest. Rom*. 25). Ovid (*Fasti* 2.195–196) dates the former to February 13.

[17] See, *inter alia*, Holloway 1994:81; Richardson 1992:267; Gantz 1974:351–352 (though Gantz takes Dionysius's description of the burial place of Hostilius [*Ant. Rom*. 3.1.2–3] as specifying some alternate locale); Frazer 1929:2:410.

[18] See also Varro *Ling*. 7.96, quoting Matius, and Tacitus *Histories* 2.91. On the collocation *funestum omen*, see Ash 2007:352.

[19] For fundamental physical description, see, *inter alia*, Richardson 1992:267–268.

[20] See Coarelli 2007:53–56; 1983:1:161–188, 196–199; Cornell 1995:94–95, 162–163.

[21] For an inventory of the associated votive deposit, see Gjerstad 1960:224–252.

[22] See, *inter alia*, Coarelli 2007:55; Cornell 1995:94–95; Holloway 1994:81–87; Dumézil 1996:84–88. Dumézil offers an interesting comparison of the inscription with Cicero's remarks at *De Div*. 2.77–78. Warren 1907 would connect the inscription with the Poplifugia, restoring *poplifug]iod* in line 10.

[23] Holloway 1994:82.

[24] Cornell 1995:94–95.

[25] Woodard 2006:83, 143, 152–154; Scheid 2003:62.

[26] See Coarelli 2007:283; 1997:211–213, 218–223.

[27] Cornell 1995:196

[28] Nicolet 1988:219.

[29] Nicolet (1988:246) writes: "The centuries might on occasion assemble in various places: the Porta Flumentana, the Petelian grove (*lucus Petelinus*), perhaps the Aventine. . . . In fact, however, with one or two exceptions they nearly always met in the Campus Martius. . . ."

[30] The tribal assemblies, the *comitia tributa*, also gathered in the Campus Martius by at least 124 BC for electoral meetings; see Nicolet

(1988:248), who further notes (p. 247) that "until 145 BC the *comitia tributa* may have been held in the Comitium," but in that year, in the Forum; and that "for legislative and judicial purposes the *comitia tributa* generally assembled in the Forum as late as imperial times." The relocation of electoral meetings of the *comitia tributa* to the Campus Martius, in Nicolet's view (p. 248), was likely bound up with "the fundamental innovation of casting votes in writing by means of tablets (*tabellae*)," which allowed all of the tribes to vote at one time and consequently required a large space for the simultaneous gathering; "In any case, during the whole of the last century of the Republic the electoral *comitia tributa* were held in the enclosure assigned to the *comitia centuriata*." The place of the voting was the inaugurated space of the Saepta, perhaps earlier called the Ovile 'Sheep's Pen' – in any event a term by which it continued to be named humorously – located to the west of the Villa Publica, as if an *ovile* associated with a villa (and east of the eventual site of the Pantheon); see Coarelli 2007:263–264; Richardson 1992:278, 340–341; Dyson 2010:34.

[31] Benveniste 1969:2:113–114. For a full discussion, see pp. 111–122. See also, *inter alia*, Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995:706; Mallory and Adams 1997:345.

[32] Compare *Iliad* 9.430–431 where the sense of the verb is 'to refuse', though it occurs in conjunction with μῦθος.

[33] Burkert 1985:276.

[34] See, *inter alia*, Warde Fowler 1899:207 (with references to still earlier work); Wissowa 1971:201; Dumézil 1996:267–268.

[35] So Plutarch; others record the revelation of the coffins to have been the consequence of an excavatory event; see note 36.

[36] On the event, see also the traditions preserved at Livy 40.29.2–14; Valerius Maximus 1.1.12; Lactantius *Div. inst.* 1.22.5; Pliny *HN* 13.84–88; St. Augustine *De. civ. D.* 7.34. See Gruen 1990:163–170 for a discussion of the tradition and bibliography of earlier work. For Dumézil (1996:522) the episode was a hoax for profit: "We glimpse here a rather sordid little news item: profiting by his protector's advancement to the praetorship, Lucius [owner of the field and protégé of the Urban Praetor Petilius] thought he might make some money from his forgery."

[37] The reference is to Valerius Maximus 9.14.3, where the author tells of the noble Cornelius Scipio, who came to be called Serapio: in *servilem . . . appellationem vulgi sermone impactus est* 'he was pushed into [this] servile appellation of vulgar speech' owing to his physical resemblance to a Victimarius that was so named.

[38] Estienne et al. 2005:116.

[39] On the diachronic and synchronic semantics of Greek θέμις, see Benveniste 1969:2:102–105.

[40] See Benveniste 1969:2:133–136.

[41] Phillipson 1911:87. See also, *inter alia*, Ernout and Meillet 1959:217: "Le sens de *fās* rappelle, en effet, celui de gr. θέμις : gr. θέμις ἐστί répond à lat. *fās est* pour le sens."

[42] See Bettini 2008:330.

[43] Benveniste 1969:2:136.

[44] Bettini 2008:329.

[45] Bettini 2008:330.

[46] On the Roman calendrical designation of days as *fastus* and *nefastus*, see also Boyle and Woodard 2004:xxxiii, 279.

[47] Bettini 2008:331.

[48] Bettini 2008:331.

[49] Or *Quando Stercus Delatum Fas*; Festus p. 259M.

[50] On the work, see recently O'Daly 2002:236, with bibliography.

[51] From Augustine's Christian apologetic perspective, in which the source of Numa's rites is the infernal realm, Numa buried his writings as they accordingly ought be known *nec populo nec senatui nec saltem ipsis sacerdotibus* 'not to the *populus*, not to the Senate, and not even to the priests themselves'.

[52] Bettini 2008:351. He goes on to observe:

We should recognize that in an oral culture such as Rome was, systems of belief and cultural representation are constructed primarily on the basis of verbal communication – in other words, hearsay. But "hearsay" is not simply gossip; rather it is a source of knowledge for the formulation of shared rules. "Hearsay" defines what is *fandus*, that which is at the same time both "sayable" and "just."

[53] Bettini 2008:351.

[54] Here, at 10.38.8–9, Livy identifies them as *centuriones*; at 10.41.3 they are *armati sacerdotes* 'armed priests'.

[55] On the Samnite rite as reported by Livy and the élite force of the so-called linen league, see, *inter alia*, Van Dusen 2008:166, 226; Coarelli 1996:9–16; Dench 1995:100; and Salmon 1967:182–187, who is strongly negative, attributing much of what is described to Livy's (or his source's) own invention, allowing that "the one non-Roman item in the whole business is the gory detail of the reluctant recruits being immediately massacred and spattering the other soldiers and the altars with their blood" (p. 185). Salmon is certainly overly dismissive (cf. Dench, p. 100 n151: "Salmon, *Samnium*, 182 ff rejects unnecessarily various aspects of the account, e.g. the linen book, the name of the priest Ovius Paccius"), though for the present purposes it is of little or no consequence how much of what is described is actual Samnite tradition, and how much is Roman embellishment: the Latin distinction of *fastus* and *nefastus* is nicely illustrated by the account.

[56] See, *inter alia*, Rix 2001:689–690; Watkins 2000:100; Walde-Pokorny 1930:283–284; Mallory and Adams 1997:535.

[57] Compare *Quaestiones Romanae* 83, in which Plutarch rehearses the prodigy of a virgin, Helvia, who was struck by lightning as she rode on a horse. She was found dead with her genitalia exposed: the term here denoting her "privates" (the parts off-limits) is ἀπόρρητα (on the use of the term to denote genitalia, see, *inter alia*, Morales 2004:190–192). The event led to the discovery of Vestal infidelity.

[58] For Lysias (*In Theomnestum 1* 2), Theomnestus's claim that Lysias had killed his own father constitutes such an off-limits enunciation, one that cannot be ignored: οὐδ' εἴ τι ἄλλο τῶν ἀπορρήτων ἤκουσα, οὐκ ἂν ἐπεξῆλθον αὐτῷ 'and if I'd heard some other off-limits words, I would not have come against him'. The penalty for committing an injustice that can be classed as ἀπόρρητος, against the gods, or against

parents or the polis, is death, according to Plato's *Laws* (854E), for a person who would commit such an act is beyond redemption.

4 Where Space Varies

4.1 Introduction

We have seen that one set of reports places the disappearance of Romulus in the area of the Comitium, another in the Campus Martius. How is this variation in space to be sensibly interpreted? Most naturally and straightforwardly, what we find in these two recorded traditions, thematically parallel but locally distinct aetiologies, are dual synchronic expressions of a diachronic mythic tradition. Reflecting this *mythic* spatial duplation would be two expressions of *ritual*. There are (at least) two possible interpretations of such synchronic ritual instantiations. One interpretation would view the two ritual events as chronologically sequential; in other words, one ritual historically replaced the other by a process of spatial relocation. The second interpretation views the two as dual components of a single ritual observance, components that are spatially differentiated, continuing a diachronic event that was likewise characterized by a similar local separation.

From a process perspective, one could imagine that these two interpretations could be viewed slightly differently, in such a way as to render them not fully mutually exclusive. Thus, one might propose that a single diachronic tradition expresses itself in one ritual space and then subsequently expands to be celebrated *jointly* in a second ritual space for a time. Still later, this latter space eclipses the former, though such spatial unification would not of necessity eliminate the double expression of the ritual, only consolidate it locally.

4.2 What's in a Name?

The proposed ritual duality, whatever interpretation one might embrace, is perhaps the key to a small mystery that has been often noted: namely, that the designation of the festival of July 5 is grammatically plural, the *Poplifugia* (properly 'fleeings of the people') – a state of affairs that appears to be of significance in the face of the grammatically singular *Regifugium* ('fleeing of the king') of February 24 – that difference to which Dumézil draws attention in the passage cited in Chapter 1 of this book (see §1.1). The plural name, given the proposed ritual duality, could be read to suggest that both of the twin

rituals were at some time jointly observed, or, perhaps alternatively, that at the moment that the festival received its present denotation, there was a historical memory of a previous, spatially distinct, incarnation of the ritual.[1]

The idea that the Poplifugia constitute a ritual of more than a single day is not a new one. As early as 1907, Warren suggested: "Perhaps originally the festival of the Poplifugium extended over several days."[2] In a note, he draws Farnell's comments on the plurality of the name of the Greek festival to Demeter and Persephone, the Thesmophoria, into consideration of the name of the Roman festival: "Farnell (*The Cults of the Greek States* III, p. 86) says of the Thesmophoria 'The day may have been called Θεσμοφορία because it was the first day of the whole festival.' Similarly perhaps *Dies Poplifugia*." Palmer, with considerably more certainty (and less motivation offered), writes:[3]

> *Poplifugia* is plural and refers to at least two flights or routs. Accordingly, one *poplifugium* should be referred to 5 July and another to 7 July. To the question how one is absent from the calendar, we propose the answer that Poplifugium II, already shared with the two Pales, was overshadowed by the rites of Juno Caprotina, more especially by the ever-expanding Ludi Apollinares, founded during the Hannibalic War.

The Poplifugia of July 5, however, have their own Caprotine affiliations, as we have witnessed. On "the two Pales," see §1.4.2. On the Ludi Apollinares, see §10.5.2.1.

Romulus disappears; some say it is regicide; some say it is an apotheosis; elite members of the community are present and remain in the vicinity of the disappearance; the masses panic like a shepherd-less flock; a prominent individual pacifies the masses. This much is common to the dual traditions. But the two are spatially separated: one realized in the Comitium (see §4.3.1); one in the Campus Martius (see §4.5.1).

4.3 Boundary and Movement

A movement of the *populus* through space in response to the disappearance of Romulus characterizes each of the two local settings of the tradition. Each of those movements, moreover, can be benchmarked with respect to a sacred boundary. It is the same boundary, expanded over time from a smaller to a larger perimeter.

4.3.1 The Disappearance of Romulus in Comitio

In the one case, the scene of the action is the Volcanal and adjacent spaces. Romulus and his co-regent Titus Tatius were accustomed to meeting in this place, 'deliberating in the sanctuary of Vulcan that projects a little above the Forum' (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 2.50.2). It was there, in the Volcanal, that the Senators murdered and dismembered Romulus (Plutarch *Rom.* 27.5); or – (slightly) alternatively – the locus of the regicide was in the associated space of the Comitium (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.5; Ps-Plutarch *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 32). The masses that run to the Comitium are calmed by a report of Romulus's apotheosis, issued by one Αἴλιος Πρᾶος.

To reiterate points made in Chapter 3 – this sanctuary of Vulcan leaves behind a footprint, the Niger Lapis, a place that is designated *locus funestus*, a 'space polluted', owing to the death of Romulus, writes Festus (see §3.2.2): whatever the particular sense of Festus's uncertain remarks, the designation *locus funestus* must be bound up with a ritual association of the Volcanal with the crisis of Romulus's disappearance. It is undeniably a place set apart, this space of Romulus's meeting with Tatius, physically demarcated in some later avatar by the meter-high perimeter of white marble plates extending around the Niger Lapis. As we saw in Chapter 3, the cultic opposition *funestus* vs. *optimus* can translate into the opposition *nefas* vs. *optimus* in the spatial context of *comitium*, a gathering of the *populus* (see §3.2.2.1). As the opposition *fas/nefas* toggles between time, so a similar oscillation in status appears to characterize space – this place is *funestus*; this place is *optimus*. This place is the locus of the fire god Vulcan, a primitive fixture in the archaic sacred geometry of Rome, of common origin with the Vedic sacred flame, the Dakṣināgni, that stands at the boundary of the small sacred space of the Devayajana (see §3.2.1), positioned on the 'right side' of the Vedic sacred space, functioning "to stand guard over this particularly dangerous side, from which the attacks of evil spirits are feared."[4]

4.3.2 The Pomerium and the Sanctuaries of Vulcan

Vitruvius (1.7.1) records that the temples of certain deities, including Vulcan, must be situated beyond the city walls. The crucial periphery, however, is certainly the encapsulating sacred boundary of urban Rome, the *pomerium*, rather than the walls properly;[5] but in the history of the city of Rome, the *pomerium* was a shifting frontier. Scheid summarizes the historical situation of Vulcan's temples – the Volcanal *in Comitio* and the *aedes Volcani in Campo* – vis-à-vis the *pomerium* in this way:[6]

> Deities that presided over activities involving death and

destruction, such as Mars and Vulcan, could not be given sanctuaries inside the *pomerium*. That did not prevent some places connected with the cults of such deities from surviving within the *pomerium* – trapped, as it were, by the later extension of the city boundaries. For example, the Volcanal in the Forum remained on the spot that it had occupied in the archaic period, but when a new temple to Vulcan was founded, this was positioned on the Campus Martius, on the other side of the *pomerium*.

As we observed earlier (see §3.2.3), according to Roman tradition, construction of this temple of Vulcan in the Campus Martius is likewise assigned to the time of Romulus: thus, in reply to the forty-seventh of his *Quaestiones Romanae*, Διὰ τί τὸ τοῦ Ἡφαίστου ἱερὸν ἔξω πόλεως ὁ Ῥωμύλος ἱδρύσατο ('Why did Romulus found the temple of Vulcan outside of the city?'), Plutarch reveals the tradition that Romulus and Tatius met to take counsel with one another and with the Senate in that place – in a *space* that is characterized as ἀπόρρητος, one of several features that draw the *aedes Volcani in Campo* into parallel with the Volcanal of the Comitium. The remains of Vulcan's temple within the Campus Martius have not been found; there is thus no material basis for assigning a date to the temple. Livy (24.10.9) informs us that it was standing in the late third century BC, recording the prodigy of a lightning strike on the temple in the year 214 (cf. 32.29.1).

4.3.2.1 The Disposition of the Palatine Pomerium.

According to the tradition preserved by Tacitus (*Annales* 12.24), the *pomerium* that Romulus ploughed when he founded his city (see §1.4.2) ran essentially around the base of the Palatine (so also Aulus Gellius *NA* 13.14.2). The line of this archaic *pomerium* was indicated by stones set at intervals; cardinal points were marked on the south side of the Palatine by (1) the Ara Maxima of Hercules (southwest) and (2) the altar of Consus at the east end of the Circus Maximus (southeast; on Consus and the altar, see §§1.4.1 and 3.3.1); and on the north by (3) the Curiae Veteres (northeast) and (4) a certain Sacellum Larum (northwest).[7] Tacitus[8] continues:

> *Forumque Romanum et Capitolium non a Romulo, sed a Tito Tatio additum urbi credidere. Mox pro fortuna pomerium autum.*
>
> And it's believed that the Forum Romanum and the Capitoline were added to the city not by Romulus, but by Titus Tatius. Later on, the *pomerium* grew with the growth of fortune.[9]

These words are consonant with the common view that the Capitoline was the site of a Sabine settlement; the Capitoline perhaps remained for some time outside of the *pomerium*.[10] Regarding the circuit of Romulus's *pomerium*, Richardson suggests: "Presumably the line turned at the entrance to the Forum Romanum and ran along the Vicus Tuscus, with the Regia, the Temple of Vesta, and the Temple of Castor inside, but the relationship to the Cloaca is unclear."[11]

4.3.3 Priest, Warrior, Populus: Rituals of Space Transcended

As mentioned earlier (§2.4), there is a pair of additional annually observed Roman rituals of flight: the Regifugium and the Mamuralia.[12] The two are set as brackets around the period of transition that bridges the end of the old year and the beginning of the new, a time of dissolution and crisis, followed by the restoration of order. The Regifugium is celebrated on February 24, when the Rex Sacrorum offers a sacrifice ἐν ἀγορᾷ . . . πρὸς τῷ λεγομένῳ Κομιτίῳ 'in the Forum . . . at what is called the Comitium' and then flees from that ritual space as quickly as possible (Plutarch *Quaest. Rom.* 63). The rites of the Mamuralia are observed on March 14, the day of the Second Equirria: on this day the people ritually drive out from the city some individual who has been assigned the name Mamurius Veturius, which we can understand to mean the 'raging/frenzied one of Mars',[13] a figure who personifies the crazed warrior held in the grips of a pathological madness and who thus poses a danger to his own society – a condition well-attested for the Indo-European warrior generally, as for the Roman warrior specifically – such as the case of Horatius (on whom, see §8.7.2). The Regifugium is the retreat of the religious specialist, the Mamuralia the retreat of the military specialist. Of these two rituals of flight, marked by trauma, the former occurs as the old year is plunged into dissolution on February 24, the latter on March 14, as dissolution prepares to retreat, as the restoration of order approaches. These two flight rites are further bound to each other and simultaneously set apart from all other Roman festivals in that they alone begin on an even-numbered day – that is, an *inauspicious* day (on which, see §5.3.3).

The third ritual of flight is the Poplifugia. As with the Regifugium and the Mamuralia, the ritual is accomplished via movement through space. The path of movement of the Regifugium is one that leads out of the Comitium. In the case of the Mamuralia, the information that has survived that localizes the movement is less specific: we are told only that Mamurius Veturius is driven out of the city (Johannes Lydus,

Mens. 4.49). What is the path of movement of the Poplifugia?

4.4 The Smaller Poplifugium

At the beginning of this chapter I proposed that the data of the Poplifugia suggest and support the interpretation of two different local, synchronic iterations of a mythic and ritual tradition that stretches back along the diachronic dimension. For the sake of exposition, I will refer to the flight (ritual) that is localized at the Volcanal and adjacent spaces as the *smaller Poplifugium*. As discussed earlier (see §3.2.2.2), that sanctuary of Vulcan that has been identified with cult elements found beneath the Niger Lapis has been dated to ca. 580 BC. The Volcanal sits at the periphery of the Comitium. The earliest pavement of the space of the Comitium appears to date to the late seventh century BC – in other words, approximately to the onset of the period of the Etruscan monarchs, according to Roman tradition – and is contemporaneous with the first pavement of the Forum proper and with the construction of the Regia and the Temple of Vesta at the eastern end of the Forum.[14] Already within the first third of the sixth century BC, the structures of the Comitium were destroyed by fire, and thereafter the Comitium was paved again. It was in this post-conflagration period that the archaic inscription was cut that is found on the previously discussed *cippus* associated with the Volcanal, the earliest attested cult element of that particular monument complex.[15]

The space of the Comitium is sacred space – perhaps one could say the sacred space *par excellence* in archaic Rome. Coarelli observes: "Following an ancient rite, augurs defined the area of the Comitium along the cardinal points; evidence of this fact comes not only from the ancient writers, but also from archaeological remains."[16] The choice of this site for the sacred space that the archaic Comitium was appears to have been mandated, at least in part, by topographical features. In a recent study of the area, Ammerman remarks that "the site from the beginning was a marked place on the landscape and, over the centuries, the veneration of this place displayed remarkable longevity."[17] We shall return to these matters in Chapter 10 (see §10.5.2).

With regard to the ritual movement of the smaller Poplifugium, Ps-Plutarch (*Parallela* 32) reports in his aetiological account only that the Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ . . . εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ἔδραμον 'the Romans ran to the σύγκλητος' – that is, to the area of the Comitium neighboring the Volcanal (see §3.2.1). If the celebration of the smaller Poplifugium entailed a flight into that space of the Comitium, from what space did

that flight begin? From some other locus *within* the Comitium – as the Rex Sacrorum flees from the Comitium at the time of the Regifugium? Likely not. On the day of the Regifugium, the Rex Sacrorum is present in the deeply archaic sacred space of the Comitium performing his sacred duty of offering sacrifice; he flees from a space that possesses a character quintessentially consistent with that of his office and with the crisis that is expressed through the ritual of the Regifugium. If the passage of the masses through space is a ritual expression of the flight of the *populus Romanus*, then the correspondingly appropriate starting point for their flight must be the civic space of the city – the same space, in gross terms, from which the *populus* drives out an individual designated to be Mamurius Veturius, the 'crazed one of Mars', at the time of the celebration of the Mamuralia.

Annalistic tradition of archaic Rome records that at that nascent moment in Rome's history in which Romulus disappears, his city is located on the Palatine. In a ritual interpretation consistent with that tradition, the course of the movement of the *populus* out of the center of civic life to that distal point in space ("remote space") in which Romulus and Titus Tatius would meet to confer (see §3.2.1) is – in the case of the smaller Poplifugium – a movement from the Palatine to the Volcanal and Comitium. Such a ritually envisioned exodus of the *populus* must include a crossing of the Palatine *pomerium*.

The exact disposition of the sanctuary of Vulcan relative to the archaic Palatine *pomerium*, at whatever moment the sanctuary existed in its earliest form, is necessarily uncertain: none of our sources explicitly addresses a tradition concerning such a geographic relationship. However, the line of the Palatine *pomerium* as described by Tacitus, and the requirement rehearsed by Vitruvius on the placement of the temples of Vulcan relative to the "walls" (see §4.3.2) clearly suggest – require, in fact – that the Volcanal stood outside of the *pomerium*. Add to this the tradition that Hostus Hostilius was buried in that *locus optimus*: his death and burial (see Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 3.1.2–3) occurred subsequent to Romulus's ploughing of the Palatine *pomerium* (see *Ant. Rom.* 1.88.2–3); and in Roman tradition, burial is not permitted within the perimeter of the *pomerium* (see Cicero *Leg.* 2.58). The very name of this warrior, reveling in *foreignness* (see §3.6), indicates an extra-*pomerial* disposition.

The Servian walls of the fourth century BC engulfed the Palatine and the Comitium, requiring that the *pomerium* be advanced far beyond the Palatine perimeter of the Romulaean city (as the *pomerium* must be external to the walls). But this enlargement of the *pomerium* must

have occurred considerably earlier: the course of the Servian walls follows closely that of Etruscan walls dating as early as the mid-sixth century BC.[18] It is conceivable that at the time of the installation of the sanctuary of Vulcan that is evidenced by those structures preserved beneath the Niger Lapis, ca. 580 BC, the archaic *pomerium* had not advanced far beyond the limits of the sacred boundary around the Romulaean city on the Palatine – in other words, that the *pomerium* still lay between the Palatine and the Volcanal. At best, only a short span of time would then have separated the appearance of this structure and the onset of the construction of the Tarquinian walls and the requisite affiliated enlargement of the *pomerium*.

That some still earlier extra-*pomerial* sanctuary of Vulcan could have preceded that one evidenced by the cult remains found beneath the Niger Lapis is equally conceivable, and perhaps – almost certainly, I suspect – a more likely scenario – a structure perhaps obliterated by the conflagration that occurred in the first quarter of the sixth century BC. As we shall see later, there is evidence of a pool beneath the Niger Lapis Volcanal, which may well be evidence of an earlier cult use of the site (see §10.5.2.1). And there is more – in the report of his recent geological study of the Comitium, Ammerman observes that:

> . . . of all the new findings with regard to the site, perhaps the least expected is the evidence that the ground level on the east side was artificially lowered (in places by more than 1 m) at a time before the first pavement of the Comitium was installed. This adds a completely new element to the early history of the site. . . .[19]

The first pavement of the Comitium dates to the end of the seventh century BC, as we have noted, preceding the fire that resulted in the second pavement of ca. 580–570 BC. Is it possible that the tradition attested by Ps-Plutarch of Romans ‘running with fire’ – if that should be the proper sense of the Greek (rather than ‘running to fetch fire’ or ‘running in affiliation with fire’) – to the Volcanal and Comitium in the crisis of Romulus’s disappearance preserves a communal memory (oral tradition) of the conflagration of a structure of the later seventh century BC? Perhaps such a memory informed Ps-Plutarch’s interpretation of his source material, alleged to be the third book of the *Italian History* of Aristobulus – and perhaps it informed the source material no less; but the comparative evidence that we shall examine later suggests the centrality of fire already in the Indo-European tradition that, I will argue, is ancestral to the Roman.

The significance of the seventh-century (or earlier?) artificial

lowering of the ground level of a portion of the Comitium *vis-à-vis* the presence of the sanctuary of Vulcan at the site of the Niger Lapis is not lost on Ammerman, "since the Volcanal is supposed to stand *above* the Comitium; Festus 370L [p. 290M]," he writes[20] (emphasis is mine). The longevity of the sanctuary of Vulcan *in Comitio*, the shrine of a deity whose fire continues a far more ancient Indo-European tradition of a geometry of sacred flames, should occasion no surprise. Ammerman's insights, drawn from his study of the topography of the Comitium, are again relevant:

> There is another important theme in Roman studies that is illustrated by the Comitium. This has to do with a strong commitment to tradition: in particular, to conserving and maintaining the memory of a place that was venerated. In the present case, there was from the beginning at the site a distinctive outcrop of volcanic rock – one placed there by chance due to a landslide. If the site in this location took several different forms during its long lifetime and if the significance that the Romans themselves attributed to it witnessed elaboration and even change over time, it was to remain for centuries a place that was honored dutifully by one generation after the next. At least in this case, it is fair to say then that Roman religious practice had deep roots both in time and in the landscape itself.[21]

One might paraphrase the last clause as: Roman religious practice had deep roots both in time and in space – the landscape provided by the area of the Comitium offering an ineluctable candidate for the ritual locus of inherited Indo-European traditions.

4.5 The Larger Poplifugium

"Deities that presided over activities involving death and destruction, such as Mars and Vulcan, could not be given sanctuaries inside the *pomerium*": so we saw Scheid to observe.[22] The underlying doctrine is summed up in the dictum of Vitruvius (1.7.1; see §3.2.3), which he attributes to Etruscan *haruspices*.[23] And it must have been this (or some similar) stringent requirement that eventually – subsequent to the (Etruscan) expansion of the city walls and requisite coeval enlargement of the *pomerium* – both (1) precipitated the construction of a sanctuary of Vulcan in the Campus Martius, beyond the *pomerium*, and (2) dislodged the celebration of the Poplifugia from its locale at the edge of the Comitium to the extramural space of the Campus, a place where the presence of Fire was cultically sanctioned.

4.5.1 The Disappearance of Romulus in Campo

The traditions of the flight of the *populus* that were associated with the site of the Volcanal were translated to the site of Vulcan's sanctuary *in Campo* – the scene of the action of (in opposition to the earlier ritual) the *larger Poplifugium* – eventuating as the attested *Poplifugia*. As with the Volcanal, Romulus and his co-regent Titus Tatius were said to be accustomed to meeting in this sanctuary in the Campus Martius, συνέδριον καὶ βουλευτήριον ἀπόρρητον 'a meeting-place and council chamber' that was ἀπόρρητον, a quiet place where they could deliberate with the Senators, where they would be free of παρενόχλησις 'annoyance' – absent from the teeming ὄχλος, the 'throng' (Plutarch *Quest. Rom.* 47) – etymon of παρενόχλησις. There, in the space of the Campus Martius, as Romulus vanishes – παραλόγως 'unreasonably' is Plutarch's characterization of his disappearance (*Rom.* 27.3) – he is surrounded by οἱ δυνατοί – patricians, men of Senatorial rank. The masses (ὁ ὄχλος) are again overwhelmed by the crisis of the vanishing Romulus; they make their way into the space of the warrior-king's disappearance: there is a suspicion among the people that Romulus has been murdered, and that suspicion falls on the patricians (for Dionysius of Halicarnassus [*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.5] he is murdered ὑπὸ τῶν νεοπολιτῶν Ῥωμαίων 'by the new citizens of Rome'). As before, there is an attempt to deflect such suspicions by a report of an apotheosis. Eventually the people are convinced when Julius Proculus swears that this is so (Plutarch *Rom.* 27.2–28.3).

4.6 Some Conclusions

The scenes of action of the two aetiological accounts – that of the smaller Poplifugium and that of the larger Poplifugium – might be described as *allo-loci*. They are two variant local realizations of the same mythic and ritual space. In the celebration of the smaller Poplifugium, there is a procession of the *populus* from the Palatine, archaic locus of Roman civic life, across the Palatine *pomerium*, into the Comitium – that is, to the space of the Volcanal, a space that can be, and will be, denoted *locus funestus* – a cult characterization translating into a condition of *nefas*. Plutarch explicitly tells us of the movement of the *populus* in the celebration of the larger Poplifugium. As in the case of the smaller Poplifugium, the movement of the *populus* is out of the city, and across the *pomerium*, toward the site of the disappearance of Romulus from within the Campus Martius (*Rom.* 29.2). In each case, movement of the *populus* is toward the site of the disappearance.

But with the shift of locales, from the Comitium to the Campus

Martius, the aetiology changes in such a way as to put the narrative tradition and the ritual out of sync with one another. Why is it that, while the ritual of the larger Poplifugium – that is, the Poplifugia – continues to be one in which the *populus* moves out of the space of urban Rome to the site of the disappearance of the warrior-king, the *populus* is described in the aetiological narrative as being present within the space of the Campus Martius and retreating from it?

[1] As can be seen from the quotation of §1.1, for Dumézil, as for some others, the sense of the plural is distributive – in other words, the individual flights of many persons corporately make a plural Poplifugia.

[2] Warren 1907:263.

[3] Palmer 1974:10.

[4] Dumézil 1996:313.

[5] See Woodard 2006:152–155.

[6] Scheid 2003:62.

[7] See, *inter alia*, Simonelli 2001:151; Magdelain 1976:78; Koestermann 1967:3:147–148; Ramsay 1909:69–70n5.

[8] In describing the course of the *pomerium*, Tacitus also makes reference to the statue of a bronze bull in the Forum Boarium (his starting point).

[9] With regard to expansion of the *pomerium*, Aulus Gellius (*NA* 13.14.3), *inter alia*, explains that *habebat autem ius proferendi pomerii qui populum Romanum agro de hostibus capto auxerat* 'one had the right to expand the *pomerium* who had enlarged the Roman people by the capture of enemy territory'.

[10] See comments at Richardson 1992:70; 330. Writing in the second century AD, Aulus Gellius remarks that in his own time the question was often asked of why only one hill had long remained outside of the *pomerium*, the Aventine (*NA* 13.14.4); he then goes on to cite a document in which he had read that it was by the authority of Claudius that the Aventine was incorporated within the *pomerium*. See§7.4.2 for additional discussion of the Aventine and the *pomerium*.

[11] Richardson 1992: 293; cf. Magdelain 1976:78–79.

[12] For both rituals, see Woodard 2011, with references to earlier work.

[13] On the meaning of Latin *Veturius*, see Woodard 2011, where I argue that the term developed from the Proto-Indo-European root *wet-, denoting an acute or excited mental state, source of various words associated with mantic activity, such as, *inter alia*, Gaulish οὐάτεις (likely source of Latin *vates*), naming the mantic seer; Old Irish *fáith* 'prophet'; Old High German *wuot* 'violent rage'; Old English *wōd* 'raging' – and so in the name of the Germanic deity marked by madness and affiliated with warriors so possessed – Old Norse *Óðinn*, Old English and Old Saxon *Wōden*, Old High German *Wuotan*.

[14] See Coarelli 2007:44, 52, 69, 85. Also see Ammerman 1996:127n33.

[15] See Coarelli 2007:52–53.

[16] Coarelli 2007:51.

[17] Ammerman 1996:121.

[18] See Coarelli 2007:2.

[19] Ammerman 1996:135.

[20] Ammerman 1996:135n101.

[21] Ammerman 1996:135–136.

[22] Scheid 2003:62.

[23] See Woodard 2006:152–154.

5 Warriors in Crisis

5.1 Introduction

The Regifugium, celebrated on February 24, and the Mamuralia, the ritual chasing out of the deranged warrior Mamurius Veturius, occurring on the day of the Second Equirria, March 14, are two particular Roman cult instantiations of an Indo-European mythic motif that relates movement through space to a moment of crisis. The primitive Indo-European tradition is one in which a warrior crosses beyond the boundary of society into a remote place as he is psychologically overwhelmed, or, alternatively, returns to society from such a remote space in a similar altered psychological state. This trauma of the warrior follows upon a personal military triumph.

5.2 Overview of the Dysfunctional Warrior

As a beginning, brief summaries will be presented here of three well-attested examples of the Indo-European warrior-in-crisis, a warrior who is rendered dysfunctional (i.e., unable to perform his proper function in society) by his combat experience. The traditions involved are Indic, Irish, and Italic.[1] We shall return to these in considerably greater detail in the chapters that follow.

5.2.1 The Indic Warrior

The Indo-European mythic tradition is preserved in India in the tale of Indra's defeat of the dragon Vṛtra: rehearsed in *Rig Veda* 1.32, it is the greatest of all of the heroic deeds of Indra, the preeminent divine warrior, the Vṛtrahan 'slayer of Vṛtra'. After his ferocious fight with the monster, Indra triumphs, only then to flee in a traumatized state; his behavior is seemingly inexplicable. Elaboration is provided by the Indic Epic, the *Mahābhārata*. Indra runs away to a remote watery space beyond the Himalayas. Hiding there, he is discovered by his wife Śacī, who is led by a spirit of divination, Upaśruti. In a variant tradition, it is Agni, god of fire, who finds Indra hidden within the waters. Subsequently a host of beings – gods, seers, gandharvas – make their way to that locale, where the divine priest Bṛhaspati calls upon Indra with praises: responding to this enunciative act, Indra

waxes great once more. Nahuṣa, who had taken Indra's throne after his retreat, has become a lustful despot: Indra engineers the downfall of Nahuṣa and regains his throne. Order is restored.[2]

5.2.2 The Irish Warrior

The Irish reflex of this Indo-European tradition concerns the young warrior of Ulster, CúChulainn, as recorded in several manuscript traditions of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*: the *Lebor na hUidre* (*Book of the Dun Cow*), the *Lebor Buide Lecáin* (*Yellow Book of Lecan*), and the *Lebor Laignech* (*Book of Leinster*).[3] Stealing a chariot and forcing his way across the border, CúChulainn travels from Emain Macha, the royal village of Ulster, into the hinterlands, where he encounters the fantastic sons of Nechta Scéne: Foill, Fannall, and Tuachell. Each brother has a peculiar skill or dispensation that provides a boon in war. In spite of their advantages, CúChulainn kills and decapitates each of the three and then begins the return ride from this remote space back to Emain Macha. As he returns he is possessed by pathological rage,[4] a state well known to the Romans: Latin *furor* commonly denotes this condition both as it is applied to the warrior and also to the Roman diviner. The approaching Irish warrior's derangement and the consequent danger that he poses to the people of Ulster are perceived at a distance by the clairvoyant woman Leborcham, nurse of Deirdre, heroine of the Ulster cycle. The king Conchobor knows the identity of that warrior (*Lebor Laignech* lines 1182–1185):

> *"Rodafetammar in carptech sin," ar Conchobor, "in gilla bec, mac mo ṡethar, dochóid co hor cocríche, ro derg a láma, ⁊ ní doíthanach comraic, ⁊ meni frithálter dano, dofaíthsat óic Emna uili leis."*

> "We know that warrior mounted in a chariot," said Conchobor. "It is the young man, my sister's son, who went to the border of remote space and bloodied his hands; and he is not sated with combat. If he is not dealt with, all the young warriors of Emain will fall by his hand."

A remedy is ordered: 150 nude women are sent out to exhibit their bodies in a lewd fashion to the young warrior; when he turns his face from the sight, he is grabbed and submerged in three vats of cold water successively, and thereby his fevered rage is cooled – the crisis in the realm of the military specialist is resolved.

5.2.3 The Italic Warrior

This well-rehearsed Indic avatar of the Indo-European tradition is remarkably close to its Roman reflex, the tale of Hercules and the Palatine monster, Cacus – or, more precisely, to the Italic tradition that underlies it, a tradition in which the role of the traumatized hero was, I have argued, played by Semo Sancus, equated by the Romans with Hercules.[5] Hercules' struggle with his monstrous opponent is, again, a desperate one (the description of which closely parallels the account of Indra's fight with Vṛtra). Following his defeat of Cacus, Hercules, like Indra, falls into a debilitated state and flees to a watery locale, presented as if it were a remote space – the grove of Bona Dea on the Aventine (see Propertius 4.9.21–74). In this instance, the warrior's debilitation is one of *aestus*: the word signifies an overwhelming fiery thirst, a consuming heat that here reduces the warrior to a state of ineffectuality, but *aestus* can also denote a passionate rage and mental disturbance. The old priestess who guards the entrance to the grove refuses to allow him to enter: the rites practiced within are not to be revealed to men, nor are the nude bodies of the women bathing within the stream. Hercules forces his way into the grove and drains the stream. His crisis subsided, "Hercules establishes the Ara Maxima, place of oaths, agreements, and tithes – all planks in the structured order of Roman society; and he 'becomes' Sancus (Propertius 4.9.73–74),"[6] where Sancus is the Sabine deity Semo Sancus, whom Augustine (*De civ. D*. 18.19) and Lactantius (*Divinae institutiones* 1.15.8) identify as the first Sabine king, and whom the Sabines *rettulerunt in deos* 'assigned to the gods', writes Augustine – a configuration shared by Romulus.[7]

5.3 Roman Cult Tradition

While the Indo-European mythic tradition of the flight beyond the boundary seemingly concerns only the warrior in retreat, the cult tradition, as preserved in Rome, clearly encompasses both the specialist in religion (Regifugium) and the specialist in war (Mamuralia): these together represent two-thirds of the canonical Indo-European three-part social ideology. Whatever synchronic interpretations are to be applied – ideological vestiges of this ancestral tripartite structure are particularly well preserved in ancient Rome, as was first demonstrated by Émile Benveniste and, especially, Georges Dumézil. The latter, for example, building upon the work of Georg Wissowa,[8] showed that the structure of the three Flamines Maiores (the Flamen Dialis, Flamen Martialis, and Flamen Quirinalis) conforms hierarchically to the ancestral Indo-European ideology; and as a consequence of that, while the structure skews actual functional priestly significance by the time of the late Republic, these three

Flamines are officially outranked only by the Rex Sacrorum in the larger sacerdotal hierarchy (Festus p. 185M).

5.3.1 The Pre-Capitoline Triad

The gods that the Flamines Maiores serve, Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus, form an archaic *Pre-Capitoline triad* of chief Roman deities.[9] Jupiter is descended, linguistically and culturally, from the Proto-Indo-European sky god and is affiliated with the realm of the *priest* (and *sovereign*[10]). Mars is god of the realm of physical force, of the *warrior*. Quirinus is the god of the *masses* and has a name likely descended from an earlier **co-vir-ijo-*, linked to **co-vir-ija* 'assemblage of men' (see §§8.7.2.4.2; 8.7.2.5.1); the god thus has a name etymologically bound to Latin *curiae*, designation for the population units of Rome (as in *comitia curiata*; see §3.2.1). The Flamen Quirinalis takes part in sacred rites performed on behalf of other gods, and so demonstrates the cooperative nature that is suggested by his name.[11] Benveniste puts it this way: "In contrast to Jupiter and Mars, who represent, respectively, magical kingship and military might, Quirinus embodies a class of citizens, a 'third estate,' whose work is essentially rural."[12] This third ideological component is far more diverse than the first two, associated in Indo-European tradition not only with the production of foodstuffs and other goods, but also (in keeping with notions of productivity) with fertility, wealth, and sensuality. The Flamen Dialis is thus, following Dumézil's terminology, the priest of the principal deity of *la première fonction*; the Flamen Martialis is the priest of the principal deity of *la deuxième fonction*; the Flamen Quirinalis is the priest of the principal deity of *la troisième fonction*.[13]

5.3.2 Calendar and Cult

The two Roman ritual enactments of crisis in the sphere of religion and power – the flight rituals of the Regifugium (February 24) and the Mamuralia (March 14), respectively – occur amidst the dissolution of time, around the temporal boundary at which the old year meets the new (in the archaic ten-month Roman calendar, the year ends with February and begins with March). But a comparable cultic expression – that is, a ritual fleeing – involving the remaining one-third of the Indo-European ideological structure is absent from the events of the changing year. There is, however, a ritual celebrated, not at the boundary of the year but deep within the space of the year, that ideologically provides (linguistically, at the very least) a complement to this conceptual set of two – the Poplifugia: not the flight of the specialist in religion (*la première fonction*), nor that of the specialist in war (*la deuxième fonction*), but the flight of the great body of society,

of the **co-vir-ija* (*la troisième fonction*).

Though separated by half the span of the (archaic ten-month) year from the Regifugium and the Mamuralia, this ritual flight of the masses is not, however, thematically unrelated to the traumas of the turn of the year, expressing themselves equally as ritual movement through space. The ritual flight of the *populus* is motivated aetiologically by crisis in the realm of the warrior: Romulus, who is *rex* and warrior,[14] has disappeared – has passed beyond the bounds of mortal society.[15] The stampede of the *populus* in July is a *response* to the primitive Indo-European mythic theme of crisis in the sphere of warrior power – and the mythic theme of societal crisis equally finds cult expression in the flight rituals of February (Regifugium) and of March (Mamuralia).

As indicated earlier, the parent Indo-European *mythic* tradition of a flight undertaken in crisis appears to implicate the warrior only; its cult extension to the realm of the specialist in religion, rendering him no less a ritual fugitive, is perhaps a Roman innovation.[16] Its cult extension to the realm of the masses may appear to be no less so. One might argue that the origin of this three-part ritual structure would then necessarily date to a moment when the ancient Indo-European *concept of tripartition* (tripartism) was an active, productive process of Roman ideology. Or – and the difference may be only slight – one could contend that the operative inspiration was to be found more immediately in archaic Roman sacerdotal structure – in the offices of the priests of the Pre-Capitoline triad – or, more directly still, in that triad of gods itself. As will become clearer as we proceed through this study, however, there is an element of the primitive Indo-European mythic tradition of which the Poplifugia can be interpreted as a direct ritual expression. Doing so, however, would not obviate a synchronic affiliation of the three Roman flight rituals with the archaic triad of deities (or their priests), but would simply provide additional inherited material for exploitation in creating a triad of such rituals.

5.3.3 Temporal Anomalies: Wrinkles in Time

The relationship between the flight rituals celebrated at the turning of the year and the Poplifugia, however, goes beyond this general expression of thematic parallelism. As noted earlier, the Regifugium and the Mamuralia, the latter observed on the day of the Second Equirria, are linked to one another within the calendar, and at the same time distinguished from all other festivals in that they begin on even-numbered days. An even-numbered day is inauspicious: Virgil (*Eclogues* 8.75) writes that *numero deus impare gaudet* ‘god rejoices in an uneven number’; and Festus (p. 109M) records that *imparem*

numerum antiqui prosperiorem hominibus esse crediderunt 'the ancients believed an uneven number to be more favorable for men'.[17] Unlike the Regifugium and the Mamuralia, the Poplifugia does not occur on an even-numbered day: its position in the calendar is, nevertheless, equally unique and odd. It is the only festival marked on the *fasti* in large capitals that occurs between the Kalends (the first day of the month) and the Nones (the fifth or the seventh day of the month). All three festivals of flight are out of sync with the rhythm of the archaic ritual year.

The positioning of the Poplifugia between the Kalends and the Nones creates a dysfunctionality for the Rex Sacrorum in the performance of the duties of his priestly office, at least prior to the time of the publication of the calendar – an act, along with the publication of the formulae for legal action, traditionally ascribed to Gnaeus Flavius, Curule Aedile and son of a freedman, in the late fourth century BC: "[A]n invidious act among ambitious citizen males (rich plebeians, equestrians, and patricians)."[18] Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.15.9–11) describes how on the Kalends of each month, when a Pontifex Minor has identified the appearance of the new moon, the Rex Sacrorum and this Pontifex Minor offer a sacrifice; the Pontifex Minor (presumably acting as the mouthpiece of the Rex Sacrorum[19]) then calls (*vocare*) the masses, the *plebs*,[20] to the Capitoline (to the Curia Calabra, near the "house of Romulus") and announces to them how many days will elapse between the Kalends and the Nones in that particular month: if the Nones will occur on the fifth day, he repeats five times "καλῶ" ('I call'; *Sat.* 1.15.10); if the Nones will fall on the seventh, he performs the same enunciative act, but does so seven times rather than five. Varro (*Ling.* 6.27) writes that the priest says *Calo, Iuno Covella* 'I call, Juno Covella'.[21] Macrobius continues (*Sat.* 1.15.12): on the Nones, the masses (*populares*) come from the countryside into the city and the Rex Sacrorum announces to them the set of festivals to be celebrated that month and their causes (i.e., aetia). Varro (*Ling* 6.28) provides a similar account, specifying that on the Nones, *ferias primas menstruas, quae futurae sint eo mense, rex edicit populo* 'the Rex [Sacrorum] declares to the *populus* the first monthly festivals that will be held in that month'; Varro identifies the locale of the enunciation as the Capitoline Arx.[22]

The Poplifugia is, however, celebrated *between* the Kalends and the Nones. On the Kalends of July, the Pontifex Minor would have proclaimed "*Calo*" to the people seven times – the Nones of July occur on July 7. Five days following the Kalends, however – two days before their designated rendezvous with the Rex Sacrorum on the Capitoline to learn the aetiology of July's festivals and the affiliated ritual

requirements – the *populus* acts on its own, in response to the warrior-crisis, frustrating the sacerdotal duty of the Rex Sacrorum (no less than the definitive action of public revelation eventually taken by Gnaeus Flavius), and preempting his enunciative act of the Nones by the production of their own enunciative act, no less an aetiological utterance: the *populus* exits the urban space of Rome (*Rom.* 29.1–2):

> ἐξιόντες δὲ πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ὀνομάτων φθέγγονται μετὰ βοῆς, οἷον Μάρκου, Λουκίου, Γαΐου . . . .
>
> And as they go out to the sacrifice, they enunciate with a shout many of the local names – such as Marcus, Lucius, Gaius . . . .

De facto, the *populus* creates its own Nones – not on the seventh day, the proper Nonal day for July – but on the fifth – a proper Nonal day for some months – but anomalous for July. Just as on February 24, with its celebration of the Regifugium ('flight of the *rex*'), the Rex Sacrorum again finds himself in a crisis of office on the Nones of July, precipitated by a crisis among the *populus*, which is in turn precipitated by a crisis of the military specialist – the disappearance of the warrior Romulus. The ancient Indo-European ideology interlocks.

5.3.4 Warrior-Crisis and the Conflation of Days

But the crisis of the *populus Romanus* that sends it into flight is not *uniquely* motivated as a response to the disappearance of Romulus. As we began (§§1.2 and 1.3), we saw that for Varro (*Ling.* 6.18) the Poplifugia is no less a response to warrior trauma, but the aetiology is different: the cause of that trauma is a set of military incursions made against Rome by neighboring peoples subsequent to the Gallic invasion. The same can be said of Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.2.14), *mutatis mutandis*, who identifies the cause of the warrior trauma as a retreat of the Romans from an Etruscan force. In setting out this aetiology, Macrobius conflates the Poplifugia of July 5 with the rites of the Nones of July 7, the Nonae Caprotinae. For Plutarch, the ritual events of the Nones of July are equally motivated by military crisis: the cause is the previously mentioned Latin attack following the Gallic conquest (*Cam.* 33.1–7); for Ps-Plutarch (*Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30), as for Ovid (*Ars am.* 2.257–258), the military crisis is that of an attack by the Gauls themselves.

Conversely, the crisis of Romulus's disappearance is also offered as the motivation for the rites of the Nonae Caprotinae. Thus, as noted earlier (see §2.2), at *Life of Romulus* 29.2, as Plutarch offers a ritual aetiology, he writes:

ἡ δ’ ἡμέρα ᾗ μετήλλαξεν, ὄχλου φυγὴ καλεῖται, καὶ νῶναι Καπρατῖναι . . . .

And the day on which he was transformed they call the Poplifugia and the Nonae Capratinae . . ..

At *Life of Numa* 2.1–2 (see §2.2.2), Plutarch states that Romulus was offering a sacrifice at the Αἰγὸς Ἕλος ‘Goat’s Marsh’ (i.e., Caprae Palus) on the day that is called the Nonae Capratinae – specifying the date as July 5 – when he disappeared. And at *De Fortuna Romanorum* 8, Plutarch observes regarding Romulus:

λέγουσι γὰρ ἐκλείποντος τοῦ ἡλίου ἠφανίσθαι νώναις καπρατίναις, ἣν ἄχρι νῦν ἡμέραν ἐπιφανῶς ἑορτάζουσιν.

For they say that he vanished during a solar eclipse on the Nonae Capratinae, which day up until now they celebrate conspicuously.

And so on.

5.4 Some Conclusions

At this point, we have of course come full circle yet again – and so we return to a pair of observations made the last time we found ourselves at this destination: (1) that the festival of the Poplifugia and that of the Nones of July (the Nonae Caprotinae) “are thematically and ritually linked;” and (2) that “there can be little doubt that the Poplifugia were celebrated on July 5” while “the Nones of July occur on July 7.”

What we had not explored the last time we offered these observations, however, was (1) the crisis in the office of the Rex Sacrorum that is precipitated by the festival of July 5, occurring before the priest’s Nonal enunciation; and (2) the Indo-European mythic background of the thematic elements of the Poplifugia – the tale of the traumatized warrior and the affiliated elements of ambulation and remote space. The Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae are thematically linked in that they are both ritual expressions of this deeply archaic mythic tradition. They are in some sense allo-rituals: regardless of their ultimate ontogeny, this much seems plain from the testimony of the ancient Roman and Greek sources.

[1] My initial exploration of the Indo-European myth of the dysfunctional warrior appears in Woodard 2006:191–217. In that work, the commonalities are framed as expressions of the tradition of the warrior who slays a tricephalic foe, building on Dumézil's recognition of Indic (actually Indo-Iranian, as will become clear as we move along) and Irish reflexes of the tricephal slayer. In Woodard 2006, I commented (p. 206):

Dumézil's own interpretative analysis focuses upon the canonical Indo-European "threeness" of the several accounts and upon the calming or cooling of the hero which follows his destruction of the monstrous tricephalic foe. These are undeniably central and crucial elements of the traditions; however, I would claim that equal, if not greater, significance lies in events acted out within the spatial domain – the hero's withdrawal to a place beyond "the boundary," his eventual return, and the benefit that society accrues upon his return.

In addition to advocating this core notion of the trauma and restoration of the warrior, Woodard 2006 also adds to the Indic and Celtic traditions an important Italic mythic cognate and, *inter alia*, relevant traditions of the priests called the Fratres Arvales. In the present work, I both add to the Italic – mythic and ritual – coverage significantly (as well as to the Indo-Iranian) and claim that there are still additional "central and crucial elements of the tradition" – that is, the parent Indo-European tradition as it finds expression in the reflexes of that tradition that are preserved among the several descendent cultures.

[2] The account as summarized here is that of *Mahābhārata* 5.9–18. More details are developed in the discussions later. See also Woodard 2006:206–209; 2010:30ff.

[3] See especially O'Rahilly 1976; Bergin and Best 1929; Strachan and O'Keeffe 1912.

[4] On the rage of the Indo-European warrior and the vocabulary with

which it is named, see Dumézil 1942:11–33.

[5] See Woodard 2006:189–205.

[6] Woodard 2006:215.

[7] On Semo Sancus and his position in the myth of the retreating warrior-in-crisis, see Woodard 2006:184–189, 214–219, 221–224.

[8] See Wissowa 1971:12, 131–134.

[9] See Woodard 2006:20–39.

[10] On the relationship of priest and sovereign, especially as revealed by the ritual of the Regifugium, see Woodard 2011, with references to earlier work by Benveniste. See also the extensive body of work by N. J. Allen (*inter alia*, Allen 1987), who argues for a four-part ideological structure.

[11] See Dumézil 1996:160–161; Dumézil credits the etymological analysis of the god's name to Kretschmer. Citing Kretschmer 1920, Benveniste (2001[=1945]:440) similarly writes, referring to the old idea that Quirinus was a warrior deity:

"The allegedly 'bellicose' nature of Quirinus is no longer tenable. Analysis of his name assigns him a quite different function. *Quirinus* is the god of the *Quirites*, citizens gathered together in a *curia*. These three words have a common base: **couiria*, 'meeting of the *viri*,' of which a masculine form **co-uirio-* is attested by Volscian *covehriu*, '*conventu*'."

See §§8.7.2.4.2; 8.7.2.5.1 on these matters.

[12] Benveniste 2001a[=1945]:440. For the French wording, see Benveniste 1945.

[13] On the Roman preservation of Indo-European tripartite ideology generally, see Dumézil 1996. See also my discussion in Chapter 1 of Woodard 2006.

[14] And thus like Indra in this regard.

[15] The alternative aetiologies of the Poplifugia, in instances conflated with the Nonae Caprotinae, similarly constitute episodes of crisis in the military realm, as we have seen.

[16] Though there may be evidence of a broader Indo-European, especially Celtic, distribution of the mythic theme extended to (or otherwise involving) *la première fonction* (to be explored in a future study).

[17] See also, *inter alia*, Pliny *HN* 28.23; Plutarch *Quaest. Rom.* 25; Censorinus *De die natali* 20.4.

[18] King 2006:28; "Multiple . . . sources of the first centuries BCE and CE attest that Flavius . . . displayed a calendar in the Roman Forum containing the list of days for legal action (*dies fasti* and *nefasti*) along with the *dies comitiales*" (pp. 27–28; see also p. 233n36 for a list of sources).

[19] Little is known about the Pontifices Minores: "Minor priesthoods, too, such as the so-called 'lesser' *pontifices* and *flamines* (who are now,

admittedly, little more than names to us) were also reserved for the equites, as were many of the ancient priesthoods of the Latin cities round Rome" (Beard, North and Price 1998:1:260). Both the Rex Sacrorum and the Pontiffs were members of the Pontifical College, along with the Flamens (Major and Minor) and Vestal Virgins (see, *inter alia*, Scheid 2003:133–134; Wissowa 1971:501–523).

[20] Servius (*Aeneid* 8.654) states . . . *ut ibi patres vel populus calarentur*.

[21] On the text and its difficulties, see Flobert 1985:102–103n7.

[22] King (2006:28) addresses the matter of the Rex Sacrorum's Nonal enunciations following the time of the publication of the calendar by Flavius:

But what happened to the oral ceremonial announcement of festivals on the Nones? Macrobius implies that the rites of the Kalends and Nones ceased with Flavius' posting of the days (Macrob. *Sat*. 1.15.9). But this seems misguided. As John Scheid has argued, performance of these monthly calendar rites probably continued down into the Augustan age, because they still served a socio-religious function by affirming the temporal order, a ritual supplement inaugurating the month. In addition, Varro, writing perhaps as late as the early Augustan period, refers to the rites of the Kalends and the *sacra Nonalia* in the present tense; the late Augustan *Fasti Praenestini* seems to do this as well, although lacunae prevent confirmation.

6 Structures: Matrix and Continuum

6.1 Introduction

Elements of the ancient Indo-European myth of the warrior who journeys to or from a remote space in crisis find ritual expression in Rome. The various attested forms of that archaic mythic tradition share a common structure – a matrix of primitive component features.[1] Each feature of the matrix figures prominently in the Italic reflex of the myth that was summarized in Chapter 5. A subset of these features, those that come into play with the onset of the warrior's trauma, also form fundamental components of the Roman rituals of July 5 and July 7.[2] Those structural elements that can be identified in the Roman ritual complex composed of the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae are as follows:

(1) CRISIS OF THE WARRIOR
(2) FLIGHT AND A DISTANT LOCALE
(3) FEMININE EROTICISM
(4) CLAIRVOYANT WOMAN
(5) APPLICATION OF WATERS
(6) ORDER AND INAUGURATION

These will each be discussed in detail in the following pages: this chapter addresses feature (1); the remaining five features are treated in turn in each of the ensuing chapters.

6.2 Feature (1): Crisis of the Warrior

CRISIS OF THE WARRIOR is a baseline, defining element of the Indo-European myth. The efficacy of the military specialist is compromised in a crisis setting: he becomes a dysfunctional warrior. This compromise – this dysfunctionality – is either active or passive: either the warrior becomes a threat to the society he is intended to protect, or he is removed from a social presence in a traumatized state. Stated slightly differently, the warrior-in-crisis is a neurotic or psychotic figure exhibiting a pathological rage, like CúChulainn, or a debilitating psychological frailty, like Indra and Heracles. The latter condition might be practically construed as a consequence of the former pathology.

6.2.1 The Contemporary Case: The American Warrior

Both of these variants of the "warrior beyond the boundary" must surely be borne of the experience of the Indo-European warrior in and after battle. They are two expressions of a pathology that compromises the ancient warrior's worth to society: the maniacal rage that will not subside and the paranoid post-traumatic retreat from the warrior's social function. Both conditions are, *mutatis mutandis*, painfully well-attested still. *The New York Times* recently reported a study that estimates that "about 35 percent of soldiers and marines who deploy to Iraq will ultimately suffer from PTSD [Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder]."[3] Central among symptoms of PTSD are various forms of social avoidance or isolationism.[4] Violent acts committed against others by returning soldiers as well as self-inflicted violence are no less linked to PTSD.[5] In another recent article, *The New York Times* reported:[6]

> Last month the Army reported that at least 128 soldiers killed themselves in 2008, the fourth year in a row that the suicide rate had risen, and the highest level in almost 30 years. "That's just the Army, and that's just active duty," said Paul Rieckhoff, executive director of Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America. "That doesn't take into account the vets in Trenton, the vets in Newark or the vets anywhere else that committed suicide, and we think that those numbers are much higher."

Similarly, *The New York Times* has reported on incidents of post-combat violence committed against other persons – members of the society on behalf of which the soldier was sent into combat, as well as against fellow soldiers:[7]

> *The New York Times* found 121 cases in which veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan committed a killing in this country, or were charged with one, after their return from war. In many of those cases, combat trauma and the stress of deployment – along with alcohol abuse, family discord and other attendant problems – appear to have set the stage for a tragedy that was part destruction, part self-destruction.
>
> Three-quarters of these veterans were still in the military at the time of the killing. More than half the killings involved guns, and the rest were stabbings, beatings, strangulations and bathtub

drownings. Twenty-five offenders faced murder, manslaughter or homicide charges for fatal car crashes resulting from drunken, reckless or suicidal driving.

About a third of the victims were spouses, girlfriends, children or other relatives, among them 2-year-old Krisiauna Calaira Lewis, whose 20-year-old father slammed her against a wall when he was recuperating in Texas from a bombing near Falluja that blew off his foot and shook up his brain.

A quarter of the victims were fellow service members, including Specialist Richard Davis of the Army, who was stabbed repeatedly and then set ablaze, his body hidden in the woods by fellow soldiers a day after they all returned from Iraq.

And the rest were acquaintances or strangers, among them Noah P. Gamez, 21, who was breaking into a car at a Tucson motel when an Iraq combat veteran, also 21, caught him, shot him dead and then killed himself outside San Diego with one of several guns found in his car.

Social avoidance and acts of rage – these are precisely the two expressions of the dysfunctional warrior that we find in Indo-European tradition.

6.2.2 The Ancient Case: The Indic, Irish, and Italic Warrior

In §5.2 I briefly summarized the warrior crises of Indic, Irish, and Italic tradition, and here recapitulate them in even more succinct form, simply to remind the reader of the particular expressions of the trauma in these several traditions:

Indic

After slaying the monster Vṛtra, Indra flees into a remote space in a traumatized state.

Irish

After killing the three terrible sons of Nechta Scéne, CúChulainn flees from the remote space of the slayings back to Emain Macha in a debilitating rage.

Italic

After slaying the dragon Cacus, a traumatized Hercules (= Semo Sancus) flees from the Palatine to the Aventine grove of Bona Dea, debilitated by a condition described as a precipitous onset of thirst and *aestus* 'consuming heat; rage, mental suffering'.

This fundamental element of each of the several descendent Indo-European traditions will recur and be developed throughout the discussions of this chapter and those that follow.

6.2.3 Roman Ritual Aetiology and the Crisis of the Warrior

In the Roman ritual complex made up of the Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae, the warrior-crisis is given expression through one of two aetiologies underpinning the associated rites.

6.2.3.1 Crisis of the Disappearing Romulus.

On the one hand, the crisis is that of the departure of Romulus. Rome's first king is portrayed as the vanquisher of the neonatal city's enemies: referring to the diametrically opposite peaceful reign of Romulus's successor, Numa Pompilius, Livy (1.15.7) writes, at the close of his discussion of Romulus' military conquests:

> *Ab illo enim profecto viribus datis tantum valuit ut in quadraginta deinde annos tutam pacem haberet.*
>
> Most assuredly it was through the force provided by him that [Rome] prevailed so as to possess a secure peace for the next forty years.

This conjunction of the two reigns – that of Romulus and that of Numa – is of unexpected import for the Roman expression of the Indo-European warrior-in-crisis myth, as we shall see (§11.5.3). Dionysius of Halicarnassus also rehearses the martial accomplishments of Romulus; after doing so, he judges that the warrior was cut short in his achievements (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.1–2):

> Οὗτοι συνέστησαν οἱ πόλεμοι Ῥωμύλῳ λόγου καὶ μνήμης ἄξιοι. τοῦ δὲ μηδὲν ἔτι τῶν πλησίον ἐθνῶν ὑπαγαγέσθαι ταχεῖα ἡ τελευτὴ τοῦ βίου συμβᾶσα ἔτι ἀκμάζοντι αὐτῷ τὰ πολέμια πράττειν ἐν αἰτίᾳ γενέσθαι

ἔδοξε· περὶ ἧς πολλοὶ παραδέδονται λόγοι καὶ διάφοροι.

> These are Romulus's wars, worthy of mention and memory. And that he did not subjugate still more of the neighboring peoples – the sudden end to his life while he was still in his prime for making war seems to be the cause of that: and regarding this many and different accounts are offered.

These are λόγοι 'accounts' of a mysterious vanishing into heaven – which are μυθωδέστεροι 'more mythic' for Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.2) – or of homicidal treachery – which are πιθανώτεροι 'more credible' (*Ant. Rom.* 2.56.3): in a sudden onset of crisis the preeminent warrior's prowess has been rendered ineffectual.

6.2.3.2 Crisis of the Invading Enemy.

Alternatively, the Roman warrior-crisis takes the form of an incursion by a hostile force that plunges the Romans into a state of panic and aporia. As does Ovid in his *Ars Amatoria* (2.257–258), Ps-Plutarch presents the tyrannizing force as Gallic (*Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30):

> ΑΤΕΠΟΜΑΡΟΣ Γάλλων βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίοις πολεμῶν ἔφη μὴ πρότερον ἀναχωρῆσαι, ἐὰν μὴ τὰς γυναῖκας εἰς συνουσίαν ἐκδῶσι.

> When Atepomarus, king of the Gauls, was fighting the Romans, he said that he would not withdraw until they had handed over their wives for sex.

For Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.2.14), *populus a Tuscis in fugam versus sit* 'the *populus* was put to flight by the Etruscans'. Plutarch also knows of Etruscan involvements (*Cam.* 33.1 [and cf. 34.3]), but his core tradition is that the Romans face, in the wake of the Gallic destruction of Rome, an oppressive Latin military force (*Cam.* 33.2; *Rom.* 29.3), which, as we saw, Macrobius attests no less than Plutarch (*Sat.* 1.11.37), as does Varro (*Ling.* 6.18): *Ficuleates ac Fidenates et finitimi alii, contra nos coniurarunt* 'Ficuleans and Fidenians and other neighbors, [who] conspired against us' – so that *tumultu repente fugerit populus* 'the people suddenly fled in panicked confusion'. The warriors' prowess has collectively been rendered ineffectual.

If the homicidal account of the warrior-in-crisis tradition is 'more credible' (πιθανώτερος) than the 'more mythic' (μυθωδέστερος) apotheosis account – if it lies at some greater remove from a reference

point of μῦθος 'myth' – then, we may safely say, the foreign-invasion variant is notably farther removed. The forces that precipitate the warrior-crisis in this instance are Rome's historical adversaries. This variant aetiological account is no tale of how a warrior-king who had been fathered by a god avoided death, the fate of all humanity, by being transported into a divine state; no tale of how such a god-fathered warrior-king was murdered by patricians who sliced his body into small parts and smuggled them away from the scene of the murder, hidden in the folds of their robes. The account of the slave-women's rescue of the Romans from a Latin (or Gallic or Etruscan) threat is a more fully historicized account, one fitted in a frame constructed of elements episodic to Republican Rome.

6.3 Camillus and the Crisis of the Warrior

Though for Plutarch, even this λόγος – that of the slave-women and a foreign warrior incursion – is to be labeled μυθώδης 'mythic' (*Cam.* 33.2), at least in comparison with another account of this Latin conflict that he knows (*Cam.* 34.1–35.4):

> Τὸν δ' ἕτερον λόγον οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν συγγραφέων δοκιμάζοντες οὕτω λέγουσιν . . ..
>
> But most writers put their stamp of authority on the other account and tell it this way . . ..

The ἕτερος λόγος 'other account' of this confrontation with Latin enemies subsequent to the Gallic siege of Rome is one in which the Roman *dictator* Camillus, rather than the *wise* Tutula and her slave-women, takes center stage – Furius Camillus, whom, writes Livy (5.49.7), the Roman army proclaimed to be *Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis* 'Romulus and father of his country and the second founder of Rome', following his slaughter of the Gauls when they withdrew from the besieged and wrecked city.[8] Plutarch too knows Camillus as 'the second founder of Rome' κτίστης τῆς Ῥώμης δεύτερος (*Cam.* 1.1; *De exilio* 15).

6.3.1 The ἕτερος λόγος: Camillus, the Second Romulus

As the process of rebuilding the razed Rome was begun, the Latins and Volsci launched an attack against the Roman army in the field. Camillus was thus compelled to assemble another force, an army of those citizens who would normally be considered too old for military

service; with this force he then maneuvered behind the Latin and Volscian armies and lit fires to signal his presence in the rear to the regular Roman army positioned in front of the enemy lines. The Latins and Volsci, then finding themselves facing Roman warriors on two fronts, built defensive works while they awaited the arrival of reinforcements. Camillus, fearing that he would find his own position sandwiched between two enemy lines with the coming of such reinforcements, took advantage of a strong wind that blew toward the enemy camp at sunrise and attacked the wooden defensive works of the Latins and Volsci with flaming weapons. The wind whipped the flames into an inferno; the Latin and Volscian armies were forced to choose between being burned alive or fleeing the enclosures: the Romans cut down most of those who made the latter choice. Camillus then moved his army into enemy territory, defeating Aequi and Volsci. He next went to the aid of Rome's ally Sutrium. En route, Camillus and his soldiers met refugees fleeing from the city who told them that the Etruscans had already captured Sutrium; reaching the city while it was still being looted, and surprising the Etruscans, Camillus recaptured the town, killing or capturing the Etruscan invaders (*Cam.* 35.4):[9]

> Τὴν μὲν οὖν Σουτρίνων πόλιν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ δὶς ἁλοῦσαν οὕτω συνέβη καὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας ἀποβαλεῖν, καὶ τοὺς ἀφῃρημένους ἀπολαβεῖν διὰ Κάμιλλον.
>
> And so it happened that the city of Sutrium was twice captured in a single day – those who held it, lost it; and those who'd had it taken, got it back, because of Camillus.

6.3.2 The Integration of Myth along an Axis of Historicity

The three λόγοι that serve as aetia of the Poplifugia-Nonae Caprotinae ritual complex and that ἕτερος λόγος, the 'other account', the tale of Camillus – the "second Romulus" – and the Latin threat that he fends off, arrange themselves as loci along a continuum of "mythicity" and "historicity." Toward one end of the continuum lies the 'more mythic' (μυθωδέστερος) apotheosis account of Romulus's disappearance; progressing toward the historicity aspect of the continuum, the second locus is occupied by the πιθανώτερος 'more credible' account of the murder of the divinely fathered warrior-king Romulus; third comes the account of Tutula (or Philotis, etc.) and her slave-women followers, who by their seductions deliver Rome from the threat of Republican Rome's historical enemies. But even this qualifies as

μυθώδης ‘mythic’; farthest in the direction of “historicity” (the fourth locus) lies the account of Furius Camillus, the second Romulus, who, rather than the sagacious slave-woman, is Rome’s deliverer from Italic hordes:

```
Continuum of Historicity
Mythicity-------1-------2-------3-------4-------
Historicity
Locus 1       apotheosis of Romulus
Locus 2       homicide of Romulus
Locus 3       delivery by Tutula
Locus 4       delivery by Camillus
```

I say “in the direction of ‘historicity’” as even this account must be heavily imbued with μῦθος ‘myth’. As a historical figure, and one central to Annalistic tradition,[10] Camillus has not fared well among recent historians. Dumézil points out that “one of the greatest and most open-minded of them, Theodor Mommsen, wrote that the chronicle of Camillus had become the falsest of all the Roman legends, ‘die verlogenste aller römischen Legenden.’”[11] Forsythe writes: “Livy’s account of Camillus’ defeat of the Gauls and seizure of the intended ransom could hardly be more chauvinistic and was probably the creation of the annalists of the first century B.C.”[12] Camillus is “the most artificially contrived of all Rome’s heroes,” writes Cornell,[13] who continues: “The part played by Camillus in the Gallic saga is demonstrably a late and artificial accretion. Even the story of his exile may be no more than a device to dissociate him from the disaster of the Allia.”[14] The account of his exile in Ardea (see §6.3.2.3) is very likely “a device” – but one that serves a function beyond merely removing Camillus from the episode of the disastrous Gallic defeat of the Romans by the river Allia, as we shall see.

6.3.2.1 Aetiologies and Not.

The first three foci of this continuum are bound to each other as variant aetiologies of the ritual observances of July 5 and July 7. While the fourth is distinct to the extent that it is not offered as an aetiology for that ritual complex, it constitutes a “historical” alternative to the third aetiology – the tradition of the Latin defeat by Tutula and her slave-women – and it is thematically connected to the set of three aetiologies as “warrior-crisis.” But more than this, the ἕτερος λόγος ‘other account’ is conceptually linked to the Indo-European myth of the warrior-in-crisis that finds ritual expression in

the Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae. In the Indo-European traditions, the warrior who had disappeared beyond the boundary, who was removed to a remote locale, reappears, and emerges from that remote space; and, hence, the loss of warrior efficacy consequent to disappearance, ultimately to the detriment of society, is *eliminated*. Romulus had disappeared in a ritually remote space, beyond the boundary (the boundary of the *pomerium*; see §7.5), resulting in panic and aporia among the *populus*, rehearsed in the flight rites of July 5 and July 7. In contradistinction to the *disappearing* Romulus, Camillus, the "second Romulus," *appears* out of a remote space, returning from a flight (φυγή) away from Rome.

6.3.2.2 Crisis among the Populus.

Let us step back and set the stage for the disappearance of Camillus and for the ἕτερος λόγος. The tradition (see Plutarch, *Cam*. 5.1–13.2; Livy 5.19.1–32.9) reports that after having led Rome to various military successes, including notably the destruction of the Etruscan city of Veii, Camillus became disaffected by the masses (*plebs*) and was accused of the theft of war booty by the Plebeian Tribune Lucius Apuleius (Plutarch *Cam*. 12.1; cf. Livy 5.32.8), and generally of the mishandling of the distribution of booty from Veii, a tenth of which he had vowed to Apollo (see Livy 5.23.8–25.10; Florus 1.17.22.4; Plutarch *Cam*. 7.4–8.5; *De fort. Rom*. 12; Appian *Ital*. 8.1–2). The vow was not fulfilled immediately upon capture of Veii, so that it had later, as directed by the Pontifices, to be made good by the individual contributions of Roman citizen-soldiers to the treasury – an action that (in addition to other causes) *plebis animos a Camillo alienavit* 'alienated the minds of the plebs from Camillus' (Livy 5.23.11–12). A golden *crater* was to be crafted and sent to Delphi, but there turned out to be a shortage of available gold; in a selfless act, the women (*matronae*) of Rome decided to provide the needed material (Livy 5.25.8). Plutarch records (*Cam*. 8.3):

> αἱ γυναῖκες αὐταὶ καθ' αὑτὰς βουλευσάμεναι τὸν ὄντα χρυσοῦν ἑκάστη περὶ τὸ σῶμα κόσμον ἐπέδωκαν εἰς τὸ ἀνάθημα, . . .
>
> the women, having decided it on their own, contributed the golden ornaments that each wore on her body for the offering, . . .

In the wake of the fulfillment of the vow, writes Livy (5.25.11–12), the Plebeian Tribunes

incitatur multitudo in omnes principes, ante alios in Camillum; eum praedam Veientanam publicando sacrandoque ad nihilum redegisse.

incited the masses against all the nobles, above all against Camillus, accusing him of bringing to nothing the booty from Veii by confiscating it for state and for sacred usage.

Following a successful campaign against the Faliscans, Camillus's unpopularity among the masses was exacerbated (*in dies magis augebat iras hominum* 'he increased the anger of the people more every day' [Livy 5.29.10]) by his outspoken and influential opposition to a Plebeian Tribunal proposal, iteratively considered since the fall of Veii, to divide the Roman populace between the sites of Rome and Veii (Livy 5.29.1–30.8; Plutarch *Cam.* 11.1–2). Of Camillus's mind-set regarding the prospective relocation of half of the *populus Romanus* to Veii, Livy observes (5.30.3), invoking the concept with which the reader is now well acquainted from our consideration earlier of days and times and of the spaces of Romulus's disappearance:

. . . nefas ducere desertam ac relictam ab dis immortalibus incoli urbem, et in captivo solo habitare populum Romanum et victrice patria victam mutari.

. . . he considered it to be *nefas* for a city deserted and forsaken by the immortal gods to be inhabited, and for the Roman *populus* to dwell in a site that had been lost in war and to undergo an exchange of conquering homeland for conquered.

For the *populus Romanus* to move *en masse* into the remote space of Veii would be *nefas*: it is a space in which the *populus* does not belong – it is a space that is off-limits for the *populus Romanus*.

6.3.2.3 Camillus's Flight and Restoration.

Ultimately, Camillus would flee into exile (*in exsilium abiit* [Livy 5.32.9]) in the city of Ardea (Plutarch *Cam.* 23.2–3):

. . . ἐν ᾗ διέτριβε Κάμιλλος ἀργῶν ταῖς πράξεσι μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν καὶ ἰδιωτεύων, ἐλπίδας δὲ λαμβάνων καὶ διαλογισμοὺς οὐχὶ τὸ λαθεῖν καὶ διαφυγεῖν τοὺς πολεμίους ἀγαπῶντος ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ὅπως, εἰ παραγένοιτο καιρός, ἀμυνεῖται σκοποῦντος.

. . . in which Camillus passed his days after his flight idly and

> privately, but holding to hopes and contrivances, not of a man wanting desperately to escape the notice of the enemy and to flee, but rather as one who watches and avenges himself, if the opportunity is at hand.

Much like Indra hidden in a lotus stalk far beyond the Himalayas (see §5.2.1, and §7.2), this "second Romulus" passed his days in the remote space of retreat in isolation – in "social avoidance." Camillus exited this state of suspended animation, regaining his own strength, as it were, when a horde of foraging Gauls moved against Ardea. As the secluded and diminished war-god Indra engineered a scheme by which the oppressive Nahuṣa would be overthrown, equally Camillus devised a plan of action, with inspiration that was nothing less than divine (*nec secus quam divino spiritu*; Livy 5.43.1), and persuaded the timid and uncertain Ardeans to make a stand. Leading them, Camillus attacked the Gauls at night as they slept in their camp beyond the city walls, many in a drunken stupor, slaughtering all – a now familiar motif (that stratagem utilized by Tutula and her slave-women followers; see §1.3). Word of his victory spread, and Camillus was again appointed *dictator* by the Roman Senate, holed up on the besieged Capitoline (via the efforts of a messenger who slipped through the Gallic lines around the Capitoline). Camillus made his way to Veii, to which many Roman warriors had straggled following the defeat at Allia and the Gallic seizure of the city. From that remote space – place *nefastus* for the relocation of the *populus Romanus* – Camillus the warrior returned to Rome, delivering it from Gallic oppression and saving the payment of gold demanded by the Gauls (Plutarch *Cam*. 23.1–29.5; Livy 5.43.6–49.8). Camillus, the second Romulus, did what Romulus himself could not, would not – he returned to Rome from his disappearance in a distant space.

6.3.2.4 Camillus and Space.

Matters of space lie at the heart of the Camillus = Romulus equation: *space* – the cultic building block of the Poplifugia, no less than the mythic building block of the Indo-European tradition of the warrior-in-crisis. Thus, in the paragraphs (*Cam*. 31.1–32.5) that precede his presentation of loci (3) and (4) along the continuum of historicity (with an intervening nod to the aetion of the disappearing Romulus) – that is, the locus of the tale of the warrior whose reappearance will deliver Rome from a Latin threat (locus (4); the ἕτερος λόγος) and its aetiological alternant involving Tutula and the Roman slave-women and the warrior victory they facilitate by their sexual prowess (locus 3) – Plutarch makes plain this equation of Romulus and Camillus,

whom we saw that author to identify as κτίστης τῆς Ῥώμης δεύτερος 'the second founder of Rome' in the opening lines of *Life of Camillus* (1.1). And Plutarch makes this equation of Romulus and Camillus conspicuously in spatial terms.

Following the Gallic catastrophe, Rome was left in a state of architectural devastation; Livy (5.53.1) describes the place as a wilderness, *vasta incendiis ruinisque urbs* 'a city made desolate by conflagrations and collapsing [structures]'. By the φιλοτιμία 'ambitiousness' of Camillus and the many labors of priests, ἱεροφάνται (presumably the Pontifices[15]), with difficulty αἱ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀνεκαλύπτοντο χῶραι 'the spaces of the temples were uncovered'. But the masses were overcome at the enormity of the task they would face in reconstructing πόλιν . . . παντάπασι διεφθαρμένην 'a city . . . in absolute utter ruin' (*Cam.* 31.1). The old issue of relocation of the *populus* to Veii came once again to the forefront of public debate, and once again Camillus played the role of outspoken opponent of the plan. Camillus's detractors accused him of being ambitious, and in his ambition of forcing the Roman people κινεῖν ἐρείπια καὶ πυρκαϊὰν τοσαύτην ἐγείρειν 'to refurbish ruins and to reconstruct so great a funeral pyre', and of doing it (*Cam.* 31.2)

> ὅπως μὴ μόνον ἡγεμὼν Ῥώμης καὶ στρατηγός, ἀλλὰ καὶ κτίστης λέγηται, παρώσας Ῥωμύλον.
>
> so that not only he would be leader and general of Rome, but that he would also be called founder, having castrated Romulus.

Livy offers the text of Camillus's impassioned speech delivered in response to the Tribunes urging the *plebs* to vacate Rome for Veii (5.51.1–54.7). It is a speech that repeatedly invokes elements of Roman religion, and, writes Livy (5.55.1), it was these matters that particularly moved the plebs. In his study of Livy, Miles takes note of "Camillus' *pietas*" and draws attention not only to Camillus as the second Romulus but to Camillus's linkage to Romulus's successor, Numa Pompilius: this *pietas* "makes him an obvious successor to Numa, who, according to Livy, founded Rome anew (1.19.1)."[16]

In Livy's rendition of the speech, Camillus pleads with his audience to remember that the Romans have a city founded by sacred acts conducted within delimited sacred space, *auspicato inauguratoque* 'by taking auspices and augury'; that every space, *locus*, in the city *religionum deorumque est plenus* 'is full of rites and gods'; that the recurring sacrifices are bound no less to the spaces in which they are performed than to the calendar (5.52.2). He ties the sacred rites and

relics of Rome to Roman space: the Capitoline feast of Jupiter; Vesta's sacred flame and the Palladium housed in her Forum temple; the *ancilia* – archaic shields carried by Mars' priests, the Salii, as they make their ritual journey through the spaces of the city in March (5.52.5–7). The Roman priesthood is bound to Roman space: there is only one domicile for the Vestal Virgins and *Flamini Diali noctem unam manere extra urbem nefas est* 'for the Flamen Dialis to spend a single night outside of the city is *nefas*' (5.52.13). He speaks of the many affairs that Romans conduct *auspicato . . . intra pomerium* 'with the taking of auspices . . . within the *pomerium*' – the sacred boundary of urban Rome. He asks of the spaces in which *comitia* are held: will they be transferred to Veii, or *populus tanto incommodo in desertam hanc ab dis hominibusque urbem conveniet* 'will the *populus*, at full disadvantage, gather in this city abandoned by gods and by men'? What if an abandoned Rome – with its sacred spaces – were to be settled by Gauls or by Rome's *hostes vestri* 'ancient enemies' the Volsci and Aequi? (5.53.7)

> *. . . non malitis hanc solitudinem vestram quam urbem hostium esse? Non equidem video quid magis nefas sit.*
>
> . . . would you not prefer this to be your own wasteland than a city of enemies? I certainly do not see what would be more *nefas*.

For Camillus, it would be *nefas*, in its most pronounced form, for the *populus* not to occupy the space of Rome – *sacrosanctam istam civitatem* 'that inviolate city', as Apuleius would refer to it (*Metamorphoses* 11.26) – even if it be a wilderness.

Owing in the end to an omen that occurred as the Senate was debating the matter in the Curia Hostilia, the *populus Romanus* turned away from the proposal of relocation to Veii. Livy describes it in this way. A company of soldiers returning from their guard posts was passing through the Forum. As they reached the Comitium, a centurion shouted: *Signifer, statue signum; hic manebimus optime* 'Standard bearer – plant your standard; here will be the best place for us to remain' (5.55.1; cf. Plutarch *Cam.* 32.2). Hearing this, the Senators exited the Curia and with a shout accepted the omen, *et plebs circumfusa adprobavit* 'and the plebs thronged around, giving their approval'. The matter comes to an end in the space of the Comitium – to which the *populus* moves *en masse*. Rome is to be rebuilt; Rome is to emerge from the wilderness.

The very final episode in the reconstructing of Rome that Plutarch details in his *Life of Camillus* (32.4–5) is presented just prior to his

introduction of the variant accounts of Latin aggression: that one in which Tutula and her slave-women figure crucially in the deliverance of Rome, offered as an aetiology of the rites of the Poplifugia/ Capratine Nones (*Cam.* 33.1–6); and that one in which Camillus, the second Romulus, takes the central role (34.1–5). This ultimate episode is also one in which the restoring of Roman sacred space is intertwined with the tradition of Romulus's disappearance, which will itself likewise be presented as an aetion of the Poplifugia (*Cam.* 33.7), woven together with the variant accounts of Tutula and Camillus. The episode (*Cam.* 32.4–5) is worth reading in its entirety:

> Οἱ δὲ τοὺς ἱεροὺς τόπους ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ ὁρίσαι ταχθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Καμίλλου, συγκεχυμένων ἁπάντων, ὡς ἦκον ἐπὶ τὴν καλιάδα τοῦ Ἄρεως περιοδεύοντες τὸ Παλάτιον, αὐτὴν μὲν ὡς τἆλλα διεφθαρμένην καὶ κατακεκαυμένην εὗρον ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων, σκευωρούμενοι δὲ καὶ καθαίροντες τὸ χωρίον, ἐντυγχάνουσι τῷ μαντικῷ ξύλῳ τοῦ Ῥωμύλου, κατὰ τέφρας πολλῆς καὶ βαθείας (5) καταδεδυκότι. τοῦτο δ' ἔστι μὲν ἐπικαμπὲς ἐκ θατέρου πέρατος, καλεῖται δὲ λίτυον· χρῶνται δ' αὐτῷ πρὸς τὰς τῶν πλινθίων ὑπογραφάς, ὅταν ἐπ' ὄρνισι διαμαντευόμενοι καθέζωνται, ὡς κἀκεῖνος ἐχρῆτο μαντικώτατος ὤν. ἐπειδὴ δ' ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἠφανίσθη, παραλαβόντες οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ ξύλον ὥσπερ ἄλλο τι τῶν ἱερῶν ἄψαυστον ἐφύλαττον. τοῦτο δὴ τότε τῶν ἄλλων ἀπολωλότων ἀνευρόντες διαπεφευγὸς τὴν φθοράν, ἡδίους ἐγένοντο ταῖς ἐλπίσιν ὑπὲρ τῆς Ῥώμης, ὡς ἀίδιον αὐτῇ τὴν σωτηρίαν τοῦ σημείου βεβαιοῦντος.

> And those whom Camillus had appointed to restore and mark the boundaries of the sacred spaces, which were altogether obliterated, when they came to the shrine of Mars as they were circling the Palatine, they found that it, like other structures, had been wrecked and burned down by the enemy. But as they were searching through the debris and clearing the area, they came across the divining staff of Romulus, sunk deep under mounds of ashes. This staff is curved at one end and is called a *lituus*: they use it for tracing out regions of the sky whenever they sit and make divinations by birds, as [Romulus] had used it, devoted to divination as he was. After he had disappeared from humankind, the priests took this staff and, like any other of the holy objects, kept it sacred. Discovering this at that moment, and that it had escaped the ruin of the other things – all destroyed – made them glad with hope for Rome, as of a symbol confirming that the security of Rome would be everlasting.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus briefly rehearses the same episode (*Ant. Rom.* 14.2.2), referring to the discovered *lituus* as τὸ σύμβολον τοῦ συνοικισμοῦ τῆς πόλεως 'the symbol of the social foundation of the city', and adding that this is the implement

> ᾧ Ῥωμύλος ὀρνιθευόμενος διέγραφε τῶν οἰωνῶν τὰς χώρας, ὅτε τὴν πόλιν οἰκίζειν ἔμελλεν.
>
> with which Romulus, taking the auspices, marked off the regions for the omens, when he was engaged in founding the city.

It is the second Romulus, Camillus, the dysfunctional warrior – the warrior who had ceased to function on behalf of Roman society – that emerges from the remote space of his dysfunctionality as the restored warrior to restore, in turn, and re-inaugurate the sacred spaces and boundaries of Rome, even armed with the same cult instrument that had been used by the first Romulus; and let us bear in mind that ORDER AND INAUGURATION is itself (if the sense of *inauguration* is typically a less technical one) one of the matrix features in the Indo-European myth of the dysfunctional warrior (see §6.1 and Chapter 11). It is a restoration of spaces that is fundamentally concerned with ensuring the well-being of the *populus Romanus*, lest they take flight to a place where their presence would be *nefas*. They must remain in the space of Rome: this is *fas*. Just as we have seen before, here again space alternates between *nefas* and *fas*; though in this historicizing reconfiguration of the ancient myth of the dysfunctional warrior, the alternation is not a toggling between the valencies of a single space but between those of contrastive spaces.

6.3.2.5 An Interweaving of Motifs.

A schematic illustration of the variegated fabric of Plutarch's four contiguous passages that were considered in the preceding section (i.e., *Cam.* 32.4–5; 33.1–6; 33.7; 34.1–5) might look like this, using subscript notation of bracketed recurring elements:

1) *Cam.* 32.4–5
The reappearance of the *lituus* of [Romulus]$_A$ and the restoration of Roman sacred space
2) *Cam.* 33.1–6
Tutula and [deliverance from Latin aggression]$_B$: [aetion of the Poplifugia]$_C$
3) *Cam.* 33.7
The disappearance of [Romulus]$_A$: [aetion of the Poplifugia]$_C$

4) *Cam.* 34.1–5
Camillus, the second [Romulus]$_A$, and [deliverance from Latin aggression]$_B$

Thus we have no fewer than three recurring elements:

A [Romulus]
B [deliverance from Latin aggression]
C [aetion of the Poplifugia]

These recurring bracketed elements can be plotted against the four passages in which they occur:

	Romulus	Foreign aggression	Poplifugia
1. *Cam.* 32.4–5:	A		
2. *Cam.* 33.1–6:		B	C
3. *Cam.* 33.7:	A		C
4. *Cam.* 34.1–5:	A	B	

This scheme only begins to capture the multi-dimensionality of the interweavings, which would be better plotted in three-dimensional space, and it overlooks the entailment of sacred space (a fundamental concern of the first passage) in the two aetiologies of the Poplifugia (passages 2 and 3), but it does provide a basic picture of the interacting elements in the account of the restoration of Camillus (and Rome); the two aetiologies of the Poplifugia/Capratine Nones; and the ἕτερος λόγος.

A significant contrast also emerges: the second passage, that treating Tutula and her slave-women followers, has nothing to do with Romulus (element A in the scheme just presented), unlike each of the other three passages; consider the scheme slightly elaborated by the encoding of Tutula and the slave-women's presence by "T":

	Romulus	Foreign aggression	Poplifugia
1. *Cam.* 32.4–5:	A		
2. *Cam.* 33.1–6:	T	B	C
3. *Cam.* 33.7:	A		C
4. *Cam.* 34.1–5:	A	B	

And Tutula and the slave-women stand in a contrastive functional relationship with the figure who successfully opposed the repeated efforts of the Plebeian Tribunes to cause the *populus Romanus* to flee

out of the sacred spaces of Rome – that is, Camillus, the second Romulus.

	Romulus	Foreign Aggression	Poplifugia
2. *Cam.* 33.1–6:	T	B	C
4. *Cam.* 34.1–5:	A	B	

These elements, individually and collectively, have at their core a fundamental concern with the crisis of the warrior, one that is inextricably linked with crisis among the *populus Romanus*. The slave-women who disarm the Latin invaders for the slaughter, proxies for the erotically desired virgins and wives of Rome and representatives of the realm of fertility and sensuality, have nothing to do with Romulus/Camillus, representative of the realm of physical force. More than that, in the contrastive passages 2 and 4, the two realms compete in laying claim to be the driving force behind delivering Rome from warrior-crisis. And herein perhaps lies another clue to the wide-scale "confusion" of the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae – or perhaps in some sense, of the smaller and larger Poplifugium.

6.4 Some Conclusions

Emanating from the several observations offered in the pages of this chapter are at least two conclusions of particular significance. First, Camillus, the second Romulus, unmistakably conforms in broad outline to the figure of the Indo-European warrior-in-crisis. As will become clear from the discussions of the matrix components in the ensuing chapters, however, there is not in the tale of Camillus a full and clear representation of all of the recurring features that characterize the Indo-European tradition; there is a blurring of the details, an eroding of the structure. For example, it is plebeian animosity that sends Camillus away into the remote space of exile: in effect it is the *populus* that precipitates the crisis that compromises the efficacy of the warrior's prowess, the reversal of the Indo-European prototype. Though encoded in the tradition of Camillus, there is nonetheless an expression of failure – or dysfunctionality – or warrior atrocity – that follows upon combat: namely, Camillus's failure to pay the promised tithe of war booty to Apollo. And this particular warrior-dysfunctionality does indeed engender a crisis among the *populus Romanus*, as citizens are required to surrender their own wealth to fulfill the vow. In terms of Indo-European ideology, this is a crisis in the realm of the "third estate," the ideologic realm of fecundity, goods, wealth (see §1.4.2.1.2); but in terms of Roman cultural

synchrony, it is equally a warrior crisis, as it is the citizen soldiery that is surrendering its personal wealth. The withholding of the vow is of course no less a crisis within the realm of the religious specialist: μάντεις 'seers' proclaimed the θεῶν μῆνιν 'wrath of the gods' (Plutarch *Cam.* 7.5). We shall see in the next chapter that a pronounced – perhaps even in a sense the core – feature of the Indo-European tradition of the dysfunctional warrior is that of FEMININE EROTICISM – also an expression of *la troisième fonction*, ideologic realm of fecundity, and so on. This is the element that dominates in locus 3 on the earlier mythicity-historicity continuum (see §6.3.2) – the aetiological tale of Tutula and her slave-women who delivered Rome from a marauding army, plying the invaders with sex and alcohol. Is there any hint of FEMININE EROTICISM in locus 4, the tradition of Camillus? If so, it is only a hint, and is to be seen in the account of Roman women surrendering, not their own bodies but their gold to free the *populus Romanus* from the unfulfilled vow of the warrior Camillus – the gold that ἑκάστη περὶ τὸ σῶμα 'each woman [wore] on her body' (*Cam.* 8.3): gold substitutes for sensuality – personal wealth for sexual willingness – like ideological element for like.

It can hardly be a coincidence that this, the least exact of the Roman reflexes of the mythic matrix considered thus far, is the most historically integrated of the four traditions that lie along the mythicity-historicity continuum elaborated earlier. This relationship is potentially instructive for understanding how primitive Indo-European myth is woven into historical narrative in Roman tradition. It is poetry and the aetiology of ritual that most faithfully preserve the elements of the Indo-European mythic matrix. Absent a ritual context, inherited mythic features take on a certain generic character and malleability, and they, correspondingly, become more susceptible to reshaping as general ideological notions (cultural primitives) rather than specific ritual events informed by mythic tradition. The preservation of the primitive tradition that surfaces in the Umbrian poet Propertius's account of Hercules/Semo Sancus must lie within ritual context.

Second, – and this is to reiterate what we just noted – the contrast that emerges in Plutarch's four contiguous passages of *Life of Camillus* 32.4–34.5 reveals a fundamental opposition between Romulus/the second Romulus, on the one hand, and Tutula and the Roman slave-women, on the other hand. It is one or the other that provides the aetion for the July 5/7 ritual complex; it is one or the other that is responsible for delivering Rome from an invading warrior horde. *Contrastive* claims of Roman salvation are provided by the ideological realm of fertility/sensuality (*la troisième fonction/la classe des cultivateurs*) and that of physical force (*la deuxième fonction/la classe*

des guerriers).

[1] The full set of matrix features as labeled in Woodard 2006 is as follows: (1) son of a smith god; (2) theft of cattle; (3) drought; (4) breach of the cave; (5) struggle in fog/smoke and flame/lightning; (6) slaying of the tricephalic foe; (7) crisis of the hero; (8) flight to a distant locale; (9) clairvoyant woman; (10) exhibition of female nudity; (11) submersion in/application of waters; (12) order and inauguration. The set is relevant to the myth of the hero who slays a tricephalic enemy. The first five features, which deal with the setting of combat with the tricephal, are common to the Indic and Italic traditions (Iranian traditions can be partially integrated with the corresponding Indic tradition), the Celtic tale of the warrior's fight with the tricephal, as earliest preserved in the Medieval Irish records, not being grounded in an episode of combat that incorporates these features; regarding this disparity, see note 2. The remaining seven features are common Indic (Indo-Iranian), Italic, and Celtic (with an Indo-Iranian variant of feature (10); I have relabeled the feature FEMININE EROTICISM; see the immediately following discussion). For a discussion of the matrix of seven features, see Woodard 2006:211–219, especially 217, fig. 4.4. Only features (7)–(12) are conspicuously relevant to the aetiology and ritual of the Poplifugia/Nonae Caprotinae (essentially the post-combat features). The investigation of these features in the present work goes considerably beyond the seven-page treatment in Woodard 2006.

[2] What this means of course is that the features that characterize the Irish mythic tradition of CúChulainn and his beyond-the-boundary crisis (see note 1) form a unique set with those that are preserved in the ritual complex of the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae, excepting the feature "slaying of the tricephalic foe" from the feature matrix of the ritual complex. As we shall see, however, that feature does find expression elsewhere in Roman tradition – in the tale of the slaying of the three brothers Curiatii by Horatius – a cognate condition first recognized by Dumézil (see Dumézil 1996:75n21; 1970:9–28). In Irish tradition, as in Roman, the tricephalic foe has been divided into three separate entities, three brothers in each case.

[3] Lawrence M. Wein, January 25, 2009, "Counting the Walking

Wounded," http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/26/opinion/26wein.html.

[4] "Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder," http://health.nytimes.com/health/guides/disease/post-traumatic-stress-disorder/overview.html?WT.z_gsac=1. See also Benedict Carey, July 11, 2008, "Extinguishing the Fear at the Roots of Anxiety," http://health.nytimes.com/ref/health/healthguide/esn-anxiety-ess.html.

[5] *Medical News Today*, "Domestic Violence a Growing Problem for Veterans," November 8, 2008, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/128512.php.

[6] Kevin Coyne, February 13, 2009, "At the Front, When Veterans Come Home," http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/15/nyregion/new-jersey/15colnj.html?_r=1.

[7] Deborah Sontag and Lizette Alvarez, January 13, 2008, "Across America, Deadly Echoes of Foreign Battles," http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/13/us/13vets.html. For an update of the story, see Lizette Alvarez and Dan Frosch, January 1, 2009, "A Focus on Violence by Returning G.I.'s," http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/02/us/02veterans.html.

[8] On Camillus as the second founder of Rome, see Edwards 1996:48; see also, *inter alia*, Miles 1997: 69, 89; 1986:13–19; Hellegouarc'h 1970; Syme 2009:300–301.

[9] Compare the account of Livy 6.2.1–3.10, where the fight utilizing fire is presented as an attack against a Volscian camp close to Lanuvium, and the recapture of Sutrium is facilitated by a widespread surrender of the Etruscans. See also Diodorus Siculus 14.117.1–7.

[10] “In the late annalistic tradition Camillus was the dominant figure for this period of early Roman history. Unfortunately, the surviving fragments from the lost historical accounts of Livy’s predecessors shed little light on the development of this tradition. The fragments of Claudius Quadrigarius, who probably wrote during the 80s and 70s B.C., suggest that by his day the tradition concerning the Gallic capture of Rome as found in Livy was largely, if not entirely, well established (see Gell. 17.2), but this tells us very little. Livy has clearly arranged his treatment of early Roman history so as to make Camillus’ career the chronological centerpiece of his first ten books” (Forsyth 2005:255). On the centrality of Camillus, see also Miles 1997:95.

[11] Dumézil 1980:44–45. On the myth of Camillus, see also Briquel 2008 and Allen 2009 (a review article of Briquel).

[12] Forsythe 2005:255.

[13] Cornell 1995:317.

[14] Similarly, Forsythe (2005:255) writes:

In order to dissociate Rome’s great hero from the disaster at the Allia and the Gauls’ seizure of Rome, the ancient tradition conveniently removed him from the political scene by reporting him driven into exile in the year before the Gallic catastrophe because of a dispute with the foolish and ungrateful Roman people over the issue of the booty taken from Veii (Livy 5.32.7–9). He could then be described as having been formally recalled from exile and appointed dictator in Rome’s great hour of need (Livy 5.46.4–11), and in the Livian narrative he is depicted as arriving in Rome at the head of an army just as the ransom of a thousand pounds of gold has been weighed out (Livy 5.48.8–49.5). Thus, like the U.S. cavalry in a melodramatic Hollywood movie, Camillus comes just in time to rescue the Romans from their greatest humiliation by defeating the Gauls on the spot and taking back the ransom.

[15] The Greek term is so used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (e.g., *Ant. Rom.* 2.73.3; 3.36.4) and elsewhere by Plutarch of the Pontifex Maximus (*Numa* 9.4).

[16] Miles 1995:92.

7 Remote Spaces

7.1 Introduction

In the various cognate expressions of the myth of the dysfunctional warrior, the feature of FLIGHT AND A DISTANT LOCALE is presented from the perspective of either of two geometries. The Indo-European warrior has met his enemy in combat and has vanquished and butchered that enemy; but in the wake of his victory, and of his very survival in combat, the warrior is beset by a post-traumatic crisis that compromises his role as the specialist of physical force. That episode of crisis is initiated or played out in a space that is remote to the space of the society that the warrior is meant to safeguard: in the one case, the post-traumatic warrior returns from combat waged in a remote space to the space of his own society possessed by an unrelenting rage that makes of the warrior a threat to society; in the other case – of reversed geometry – post combat the warrior retreats in a traumatized state into a societally remote locale. The Indo-European tradition preserves dual mythic expressions of this post-traumatic dichotomy of maniacal rage and social isolationism.

7.2 The Indic Warrior

The greatest of the doughty deeds of Indra, preeminent Vedic warrior-deity, was his destruction of the monstrous serpent Vṛtra – subject of *Rig Veda* 1.32 – announced in its opening stanza:

Indrasya nu vīriyāṇi pra vocaṃ yāni cakāra prathamāni vajrī
ahann ahim anu apas tatarda pra vakṣaṇā abhinat parvatānām

Now I proclaim the bold deeds of Indra, the first done by the thunderbolt-wielder

He killed the dragon and opened the waters; he cleaved the belly of the mountains

But following the moment of warrior triumph, the mighty Indra, the

"thunderbolt-wielder," finds himself gripped by traumatizing fear (*Rig Veda* 1.32.14):

aher yātāraṃ kam apaśya indra hṛdi yat te jaghnuṣo bhīr agachat
nava ca yan navatiṃ ca sravantīḥ śyeno na bhīto ataro rajāṃsi

What avenger of the dragon did you see Indra that fear passed into the heart of you who'd slain him,

That you crossed nine and ninety streams . . . like the frightened eagle you crossed the skies?

Mahābhārata 5.10.40ff.[1] describes the flight of a depressed and witless Indra to a remote place – the warrior *antam āśritya lokānām* 'seeking out the ends of the world'.[2] He hides within waters (5.10.45–46), within a lotus in the middle of a great lake on an island within a sea beyond the Himalayas (5.14.5–12). In Indra's absence, natural disasters occur and a great drought comes upon the earth – a drought that causes panic (*saṃkṣobhas* 'a violent shock'[3]) to overwhelm all beings (*sattvās*; 5.10.48):

devāś c' api bhṛśaṃ trastās, tathā sarve maharṣayaḥ
and even the gods trembled mightily, and all the great seers as well

Panic and disaster attend the beings and spaces left behind at the disappearance of the traumatized warrior-king Indra into a remote locale.

7.3 The Irish Warrior

One day, the young CúChulainn overhears the Druid Cathbad telling one of his druidic pupils that on that particular day, whoever would mount a chariot for the first time would achieve everlasting fame in Ireland. Acquiring the chariot of the Ulster king Conchobor, CúChulainn and Ibod, Conchobor's charioteer, travel to the mountain of Sliab Fúait, the elevated site from which Conchobor's warriors would by turns guard the boundary of Ulster, "to take care of every man who came that way with poetry, and to fight any others. In this way, everyone was challenged and no one slipped past to Emain unnoticed."[4] They pass on beyond the boundary into a 'remote space', *cocrích* (*Book of Leinster* line 1085, *inter alia*; and see §5.2.2), with Ibod

pointing out and naming for CúChulainn every significant *dún* 'fortress' and topographical feature they encounter as they journey into and through the space of the *Hinterland*, coming at last to the *dún trí mac Nechta Scéne* 'fortress of the three sons of Nechta Scéne' – terrible warrior brothers reputed to have killed as many of the Ulaid (men of Ulster) as still remained alive. Against the protestation of Ibod, CúChulainn challenges this triple adversary to combat: he does so by removing a withe from the pillar that stood by the ford of the river that flowed down past the *dún*, and hurling the withe into the river current – a defiant act that violated a *geis* (prohibition[5]) binding the sons of Nechta Scéne. Seeing the withe floating downstream, the three brothers confront CúChulainn, and each in turn does combat with the boyish Ulster warrior.

One by one, the three sons of Nechta Scéne – Foill, Fannall, and Tuachell – are slain, each dying in a requisite way: the brothers possess preternatural traits that severely proscribe the means by which they can be killed. Foill can only be dispatched with the initial strike of a weapon; as he advances, CúChulainn proclaims (*Táin Bó Cúailnge* lines 736–738)[6]:

> *Tongu do dia toinges mo thúath, nocon imbéra-som for Ultu a cles sin dorísse*
> *diano tárle mánaís mo phopa Conc[h]obair as mo láim-sea.*

> I swear by the god by whom my people swear – he will not in any way pull that trick on the Ulaid again when the broad spear of my lord Conchobor reaches him out of my hand.

And with the initial toss of that spear, called *Del Chliss*, CúChulainn kills Foill and then decapitates him and strips him of his equipment. Fannall ('swallow') advances next, the brother who could pass across the surface of water with the ease of a swan or a swallow. CúChulainn, who boasts of his own skills in moving over water, meets Fannall in the ford and slays him, after enunciating a similar, though abridged, oath; he decapitates this second brother and takes his gear also. The third brother, Tuachell ('cunning'), was said to be immune to all weapons, but even so, CúChulainn is able to slay him with the spear *Del Chliss*, "riddling him like a sieve"; him too he decapitates, taking his equipment as well.

When Tuachell is slain, Ibod and CúChulainn hear the wail of Nechta Scéne, mother of the three brothers, at which point

CúChulainn gathers the spoils and decapitated heads into his chariot, and the two (Ibod and CúChulainn) race back toward the Ulster capital of Emain Macha. The setting out of CúChulainn from the remote locale of his combat with the triple foe is unquestionably presented as a flight (*Táin Bó Cúailnge* lines 761–762); CúChulainn addresses Ibod, declaring:

"Dorar[n]gertais-siu dagérim dúnd," ol Cú Chulaind, "⁊ rosnecam a less indossa di ág in tressa ⁊ inna íarra fil inar ndíaid."

"You promised us a good running," said CúChulainn, "and we need it now because of the combat and because of the pursuit that is after us."

So fast do they ride that they overtake the wind and flying birds. En route to Emain Macha, CúChulainn adds to his spoils of severed heads and equipment by taking a deer and swans alive and lashing them to the chariot. As he drives this chariot out of the remote places, fleeing from the scene of combat, CúChulainn is overwhelmed by a debilitating rage that makes him a threat to his own people, the Ulaid. Arriving at the city, he turns the left side of his chariot towards Emain Macha, a *geis* ("but sometimes a challenge to battle"[7]) and declares (*Táin Bó Cúailnge* lines 808–809):

Tongu do dia toingte Ulaid mani étar fer do gleó frim-sa, ardáilfe fuil lim cach áein fil isin dún.

I swear by the god by whom the Ulaid swear that unless some man is found to battle against me, I shall spill the blood of everyone in the *dún*.

The debilitating rage that possesses CúChulainn is that warrior madness that in Old Irish is called *ferg*: the *Book of Leinster* version of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, referring to the process by which CúChulainn is robbed of that madness (on which see below, §10.3 and *passim*), records (line 1193[8]):

Tucad i trí dabchaib úaruscib é do díbdud a ferge.
He was placed in three vats of cooling-water to extinguish his *ferg*.

Like Indra, CúChulainn moves in flight between the space of his own society and a remote space located beyond the boundary of his own society; and both do so in conjunction with warrior dysfunctionality. But the geometry is reversed in the two cases. Indra flees from the space of society into a remote space when he is overwhelmed by fear following his combat with the dragon Vṛtra. Correspondingly, Indra's dysfunction is that of social avoidance – of the warrior who has isolated himself from society and so no longer functions to defend society. It is within remote space, on the other hand, that CúChulainn slays the three terrible sons of Nechta Scéne, and from that distant place of the fight flees back to the space of society, bringing with him a combat rage that will not subside. Correspondingly, CúChulainn's dysfunction is that of homicidal madness – of the warrior whose unrelinquished fury targets his own people. The Indic and Irish accounts of the dysfunctional warrior exemplify the two geometries of the feature FLIGHT AND A DISTANT LOCALE.

7.4 The Italic Warrior

On the return trip to Greece from the island of Erytheia following his capture of Geryon's cattle, Hercules journeys through the pre-Romulaean Palatine community of the Arcadian Greek Evander. Spending the night there, Hercules awakes the next morning to discover that some of his cattle have been stolen by Cacus, a monstrous creature inhabiting a cave on the Palatine – a huge beast of terrible strength (Ovid *Fasti* 1.553–554), fire-breathing (Virgil *Aeneid* 8.198–199), three-headed (Propertius 4.9.10). Hercules tracks the missing cattle to the cave of Cacus, where he fights and slays the monster.

7.4.1 Semo Sancus

This "Hercules" whom the poets pit against the cattle-thieving Cacus is a Roman transformation, under Greek influence of one sort or another, of the Italic deity Semo Sancus – or, as he is at times more fully named, Semo Sancus Dius Fidius. To rehearse all of the arguments for this identification would take us far afield from the present investigation. For the detailed analysis, I ask the reader to consult the discussions in Woodard 2006;[9] but the most fundamental of the evidence for equating this "Hercules" with Italic Semo Sancus can be easily enough set out: we are explicitly informed of the equation by various ancient authors. Citing his teacher Lucius Aelius Stilo ("the greatest grammarian and philologist of the second century

[BC]"[10]), Varro (*Ling.* 5.66) writes concerning Semo Sancus:

> *Aelius Dium Fidium dicebat Diovis filium, ut Graeci* Διόσκορον *Castorem, et putabat hunc esse Sancum ab Sabina lingua et Herculem a Graeca.*
>
> Aelius used to say that Dius Fidius is a son of *Diovis*, just as the Greeks call Castor a *Dioskoros* ['boy of Zeus'], and he always thought this god to be Sancus in the Sabine language and Hercules in the Greek.

Festus (or his epitomizer Paulus Diaconus) too makes it explicit when he remarks on the form of the oath *me Dius Fidius* 'I swear by Dius Fidius'(p. 147M):

> *Medius Fidius compositum videtur et significare Iovis filius, id est Hercules.*
>
> *Medius Fidius* is understood to be a compound and to denote the son of Jupiter, that is 'Hercules'.

Elsewhere Festus records (p. 229M):

> *Propter viam fit sacrificium, quod est proficiscendi gratia, Herculi aut Sanco qui scilicet idem est deus.*
>
> Next to a road, sacrifice is made, for the sake of those setting out, to Hercules or Sancus who clearly are one and the same god.

The poet Propertius, as we have seen, preserves an invaluable account of the Italic hero's fight with the monster and his subsequent retreat to a remote locale in a traumatized state, at the conclusion of which he explicitly reports Hercules' "transformation" into Semo Sancus (4.9.71–74):[11]

> *hunc, quoniam manibus purgatum sanxerat orbem,*
> *sic Sancum Tatiae composuere Cures.*
> *Sancte pater, salve, cui iam favet aspera Iuno:*
> *Sance, velis libro dexter inesse meo.*
> This one [i.e. Hercules], since by his hands he consecrated the orb made pure,
> Cures of Tatius thus established as Sancus.
> Blessed Father, hail, whom now harsh Juno kindly favors:

> Sancus, may you, propitious, be pleased to have a place in my book.

The fundamental observation is not a new one. Warde Fowler had already in the late nineteenth century explicitly drawn attention to Semo Sancus Dius Fidius as the deity lurking behind the denotation "Hercules":[12]

> Dius Fidius, then, and Semo Sancus are both Latin names for the same religious conception,. . . .
>
> There is clear evidence that the best Roman scholars identified not only Dius Fidius with Semo Sancus, but both of these with Hercules. . . .
>
> Again, the Roman oaths *me Dius Fidius* and *me Hercule* are synonymous; that the former was the older can hardly be doubted, and the latter must have come into vogue when the Greek oath by Heracles became familiar. Thus the origin of *me Hercule* must be found in a union of the characteristics of Hercules with those of the native Dius Fidius.

Warde Fowler in fact makes reference to the 1867 work on Juno and Hercules by Reifferscheid in which that author takes similar note of the equation "Hercules = Sancus = Dius Fidius."[13]

7.4.2 The Aventine and the Pomerium

The geometry of the Italic tradition agrees with the Indic. After slaying the three-headed monster Cacus, the Italic warrior flees to the grove of Bona Dea on the Aventine, in which flows a spring described as *avia secreti limitis unda* 'a remote stream of hidden course' (Propertius 4.9.60). In terms of geographical space, the separation between the Palatine lair of Cacus and the Aventine grove of Bona Dea is so limited as seemingly to suggest that the sort of backwoods remoteness denoted by *avius* ('lacking roads, wilderness; distant, remote') is only a literary conceit. There is more to it than this, however. The Italic mythic tradition incorporates within itself a notion of Roman sacred geography.

The Aventine hill long remained outside of the *pomerium*. When the *pomerium* was necessarily enlarged with the expansion of the perimeter of the city reflected in the course of the Servian walls (see §4.4), the Aventine was not incorporated within that sacred boundary. This is so even though the Aventine was (eventually, if not immediately) included within the circuit of the Servian walls

themselves.[14] It was only with the expansion of the *pomerium* by Claudius that the Aventine was integrated within its periphery.[15] According to Aulus Gellius (*NA* 13.14.4–6), the *pomerium* was not extended around the Aventine, *quae pars non longinqua nec infrequens est* 'which is neither a distant nor out-of-the-way region', *quasi avibus obscenis ominosum* 'in as much as it was of sinister omen owing to the inauspicious birds' (citing the augur Messala as his source). The reference is to the birds that Remus observed during his augury on the Aventine, the sighting of which did not translate into his acquisition of the kingship of Rome; Romulus, instead, was successful in that regard, observing birds from the Palatine.

The tradition of the Italic warrior's fleeing to a remote space, as preserved by Propertius, makes recourse to the disposition of the Aventine relative to the *pomerium*. Such a utilization of that sacred boundary that divides urban Rome from the Ager Romanus, smaller and larger Roman spaces of sacred significance,[16] is, strictly speaking, anachronistic – or, perhaps better said, anticipatory in perspective: Hercules' presence on the Palatine is set in the time of the Arcadian Evander, prior to the founding of Romulus's city; but the operative notion allowing the Aventine to be presented as remote space in Roman tradition must be the *pomerium*. Even the mythic-historical motivation of the doctrine of the exclusion of the Aventine from the *pomerium* cited by Aulus Gellius's augural source betrays an incipient notion of the *pomerium*, the line demarcating the space beyond which the city auspices must not be taken.

7.5 Roman Ritual

The mythic motif of the movement of the warrior in crisis into remote space, beyond the boundary of the *pomerium* in the case of the Italic reflex of this Indo-European tradition, finds topographical expression in the aetiological accounts of the Poplifugia. In the case of the smaller Poplifugium, the crisis of Romulus's disappearance is set in the Comitium and Volcanal, beyond the Palatine *pomerium*. In the case of the larger Poplifugium, that crisis is acted out in the Campus Martius, beyond the boundary of the Servian walls and the affiliated enlarged *pomerium*. The flight of the *populus* that is occasioned by the crisis of the warrior in turn finds cultic expression in a ritual movement across the boundary of the *pomerium*, out of the city and into these remote spaces of the warrior's crisis, smaller and larger (see §4.4).

This ritual movement of a host of "citizens" *vis-à-vis* the remote space of the warrior's crisis finds expression in cognate Indo-European

mythic accounts of the traumatized warrior. In the Indic tradition, gods, seers, and gandharvas travel to the distant locale, "the ends of the world," where Indra has retreated. There, Bṛhaspati ("priest of the gods,"[17] with a name meaning 'master of prayer') hymns the god (*Mahābhārata* 5.16.10–20), and the enunciative act causes Indra to grow strong once again: *pāhi sarvāṃś ca lokāṃś ca, mahendra, balam āpnuhi!* 'Protect [us] all and protect spaces (*lokās*), O great Indra, gain strength!'. The words that are pronounced are crucial to the resolution of the crisis.[18] In the Irish tradition, a body of the *populus* exits from Emain Macha to meet the warrior who is possessed with a threatening, debilitating rage as he makes his way from the distant locale of trauma. The warrior is again addressed, and the enunciative act plays a seminal role in the warrior's recovery – to which we shall return in Chapter 8.

7.5.1 Ritual Enunciation

An enunciative act also figures prominently in the Roman allo-rituals of July 5 and July 7, as the people journey – much as in the Indic version – into the remote locale in response to the warrior's crisis. In the case of the Poplifugia, as the *populus Romanus* leaves the city and makes its way beyond the *pomerium* into the Campus Martius for sacrifice, πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ὀνομάτων φθέγγονται μετὰ βοῆς, οἷον Μάρκου, Λουκίου, Γαΐου 'they enunciate with a shout many of the local names, such as Marcus, Lucius, Gaius' (Plutarch *Rom.* 29.2). Plutarch presents this enunciation as a ritual rehearsal of the linguistic component of the panic that overwhelmed the people at the disappearance of Romulus. In his description of the movement of the *populus* out of the city and into the Campus Martius two days later, in celebration of the *Nonae Caprotinae*, Plutarch records that πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων καὶ κοινῶν ὀνομάτων βοῇ φθέγγονται, Γάϊον, Μάρκον, Λούκιον καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια 'they enunciate with a shout many of the local and common names – Gaius, Marcus, Lucius, and ones similar to these' (*Cam.* 33.5). As we have seen, the aetiology of the act is different here: the enunciative event is a ritual replication of the calling out of citizen soldiers to one another as they marshaled their ranks for an attack on an enemy already weakened, in essence overwhelmed, by the slave-women – a stratagem that would deliver Rome from military crisis.

The variant aetiology of the enunciative acts of the allo-rituals of July 5 and July 7 brings us back to a point that was made earlier in passing. The Poplifugia, the earlier-occurring ritual, marks the *onset* of a crisis in the warrior realm. In contrast, the Nonae Caprotinae, the ritual occurring two days later, confounded with the Poplifugia by

some ancient writers, marks the *resolution* of a crisis in the warrior realm. The distinction is significant, and we shall return to it later.

7.6 Some Conclusions

The Indo-European myth of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior has at its heart an expression of movement through space – specifically a passage between the space of the warrior's society and a remote space beyond the boundary of society, a boundary marked in Italic tradition by the *pomerium*. The direction of movement is tied to the particular dysfunctionality of the military specialist post combat: if the dysfunctionality expresses itself as unrelenting warrior rage, movement is from the remote space to the space of society; if the dysfunctional condition is that of retreat and social isolationism, movement is from the space of society to remote space. The warrior's dysfunctional state incites panic among society's members, and, as we have noted and will see more clearly in the next chapter, the popular response is expressed as a consequent movement out of urban space with which there is an associated enunciative component. The same movement cum enunciation finds ritual expression in the rites of the Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae.

[1] Unless indicated otherwise, citations of *Mahābhārata* Book 5 reference the text of the Clay Sanskrit Library (Garbutt 2008).

[2] See also *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 2.5.3 and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.6.4.1.

[3] Monier-Williams gives the sense of *saṃkṣobhas* in the *Mahābhārata* as 'a violent shock or jolt, jerk, overturning, upsetting'. Van Buitenin (1978:207) translates the word as 'panic' in this passage, Garbutt (2008:75) as 'hysteria'.

[4] Kinsella 1970:86. Kinsella's translation of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, which includes this episode in the career of the young CúChulainn, is based chiefly on the versions of the *Lebor na hUidre* and the *Lebor Buide Lecáin* (see his pp. ix–xi).

[5] *Gessa* are prohibitions or obligations to which prominent Irish figures, typically kings and warriors, are bound, often seemingly idiosyncratic in nature: "The violation of *gessa* is such a sure omen of approaching death that it might almost be inferred that a hero is safe from harm while his *gessa* remain inviolate. Then, as his time approaches its end, he finds himself in situations where he cannot avoid breaking them, just as Greek heroes unwittingly work their own undoing when their fated hour has come and their divine guardians have forsaken them" (Reyes and Reyes 1989:327). In this event, however, violation of the *geis* summons the doom of the warrior's triple adversary.

[6] Unless indicated otherwise, citations of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge* reference the text of O'Rahilly 1976. O'Rahilly's Recension I text is based on four manuscripts: both the previously mentioned *Lebor na hUidre* (*Book of the Dun Cow*; Bergin and Best 1929) and the *Lebor Buide Lecáin* (*Yellow Book of Lecan*; Strachan and O'Keeffe 1912), as well as the Egerton manuscript of 1782 and the O'Curry manuscript published in 1966. For a discussion of the manuscript tradition, see O'Rahilly 1976:vii–xxiii.

[7] O'Rahilly 1976:253.

[8] Citations of the *Book of Leinster* version of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge* reference the text of O'Rahilly 1967.

[9] See especially pp. 184–199, 214–219, 221–224.

[10] Conte 1994:572. Conte continues (p. 573): "[H]e worked on texts such as the extremely obscure *Carmen Saliare*, texts that on account of their prehistoric linguistic nature were in need of careful exegesis."

[11] The order of the couplets is that found in the edition of Goold 1999. On the viability of Propertius as a source for the tradition, see my

remarks at Woodard 2006:203–205.

[12] Warde Fowler 1899:137–139.

[13] See Warde Fowler 1899:142–144.

[14] On the remains of the Servian walls on the south side of the Aventine, see Holloway 1994:92–102.

[15] See Richardson 1992:47; Platner-Ashby 1929:66.

[16] On the smaller and larger Roman sacred spaces, as separated by the *pomerium*, see Woodard 2006 *passim*, but especially Chapter 4.

[17] On Bṛhaspati, see Keith 1998:162–166.

[18] On the hymn and its similarities to the hymn of the Fratres Arvales, priests of the Roman goddess Dea Dia, which they chant to Mars in the grove of their goddess, situated at the boundary of that large Roman sacred space, the Ager Romanus, see Woodard 2011. On the significance of the boundary locale *vis-à-vis* the enunciation of the hymn, see Woodard 2006:224, 240, 258, 262.

8 Erotic Women and the (Un)Averted Gaze

8.1 Introduction

A conspicuous matrix feature of both the Celtic mythic tradition of the warrior in crisis and its Italic cognate involves feminine nudity. The parallelism of the episodes in these two western Indo-European traditions is striking: feminine bodies are displayed to the post-traumatic warrior at the moment of the quenching of the raging heat with which he is overcome, a quenching that is accomplished in conjunction with cooling waters liberally applied (on which see Chapter 9). The Indic counterpart offers no such precise parallel; instead, a feminine figure exploits an element of male lust in the recovery of the traumatized hero from his watery place of withdrawal; a similar motif finds expression in the Iranian Ossetic tradition, being yet more tightly bound to the Celtic and Italic accounts.

8.2 The Irish Warrior

CúChulainn has fled back from the remote space of combat, arriving at Emain Macha possessed by *ferg*, maniacal warrior madness. The appropriate measure for robbing CúChulainn of this pathological rage that threatens destruction of the people of Ulster is identified by king Conchobor (or initially by a "watchman"): Conchobor sends out the women of Emain Macha to expose their naked bodies to the approaching CúChulainn. In the tradition as preserved in the *Book of the Dun Cow* and the *Yellow Book of Lecan*, Conchobor's wife Mugain[1] is the leader of the women (*Táin Bó Cúailnge* lines 812–813); the processional exhibition of the women's bodies is followed by an enunciative act, making plain to the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior who, or rather what, the "foe" is that he must best in his enraged state:

> *. . . donnochtat a mbruinni friss. "It é óic inso condricfat frit indiu," or Mugain.*
>
> . . . they bared their breasts to him. "*These* are the combatants who will come against you today," said Mugain.

It is a showdown between the feminine breast and the traumatized warrior's mania: we shall encounter it again.

In the fuller version of the episode preserved in the *Book of Leinster*, the woman called Scannlach ('Scandalous') leads a female troop out from the city to meet the approaching CúChulainn (*Táin Bó Cúailnge* lines 1186–1193):

> *Ocus ba sed in chomairle ra cruthaiged leó in bantrocht da lécud immach do ṡaigid in meic .i. trí coícait ban .i. deich mnáa 7 secht fichit díscir derglomnocht i n-óenḟecht uili 7 a mbantóesech rempo, Scandlach, do thócbáil a nnochta 7 a nnáre dó. Táncatar immach in banmaccrad uile 7 túargbatar a nnochta 7 a nnáre uile dó. Foilgid in mac a gnúis forru 7 dobretha a dreich frisin carpat arná acced nochta nó náre na mban.*

> And the stratagem that they formed was this: to send the band of women outside to meet the young warrior, three times fifty women – ten and seven score women – audaciously absolutely naked, in unison, with their woman-leader Scannlach being at the front, to exhibit their nakedness and shame to him. The young women all came outside and revealed all their nakedness and shame to him. The young warrior hides his face from them: he turned his eyes toward the chariot lest he should see the nakedness or shame of the women.

Recension III of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*[2] names nine of the women, including the leader of the *Book of Leinster* version, Scannlach: "Sgamalus 7 Sgannlach 7 Sgiathan, Feidlim 7 Deigtini, Finnchas 7 Finngeal 7 Fidniam 7 Níam ingen Celtair." And in this Recension III there is preserved an even more explicit description of what it is the women are to do and of what the anticipated outcome will be; Conchobor declares:

> *Eirghid in banmacradh 7 nochtaid a cithi ris 7 a n-ochta 7 i n-urbruindi. 7 mad firlaech é, ni-ris ṫriblaingesdair do a ḟaisgin. 7 cuirfider i ndabhchaibh fuarusci e, con ṫdecha [a] ferg de.*

> Let the young women go out and bear their nipples and their breasts and their bosoms. And if he is true warrior, he will not endure that sight. And he shall be put in a vat of cooling-water until his *ferg* goes from him

The warrior is overpowered in the face of the massive show of feminine nudity.[3] As he averts his face, distracted, CúChulainn is seized by warriors, who submerge him in, as we saw in §7.3, three vats of cold water consecutively, thereby quenching his *ferg* – his warrior mania (see Chapter 9). The threat of the dysfunctional warrior has been neutralized.

It is important to see that in the recounting of the young CúChulainn's experience of combat, erotically displayed women, and submersion in water, there is no suggestion that these events constitute a warrior initiation, as some have assumed, including Dumézil, who invokes for comparison a Kwakiutl cannibalistic initiation reported by Boas and Frazer.[4] If the young Ulster warrior had overheard the Druid Cathbad instructing his students that whoever would mount a chariot for the first time on that same day would acquire imperishable fame in Ireland, CúChulainn's consequent foray into the remote region of the sons of Nechta Scéne on Conchobor's chariot did not occasion the initial expression of his warrior rage, which had been previously elicited (on which see §8.6.2.1). And on a day prior to his chariot journey beyond the borders of Ulster, CúChulainn had similarly overheard the Druid announce that the one who took up arms on that day would achieve everlasting fame, though that warrior's life would be short. On that occasion as well, CúChulainn acted to ensure that the prophecy was realized in his own being.

The use of feminine nudity to disable the warrior is itself not unique to the occasion of youthful CúChulainn's enraged return to Emain Macha following combat with Nechta Scéne's sons. In the *Mesca Ulad* (the 'Intoxication of the Ulaid'),[5] the woman Riches strips in front of the veteran CúChulainn on the battlefield so that the king Crimthann Nia Náir, her foster son, can kill him: when she exposes herself to CúChulainn, he averts his gaze by turning his face to the ground, thus leaving himself open to the attack of Crimthann. Lóeg, CúChulainn's charioteer, saves him by casting a stone at Riches, seemingly striking her in the back,[6] and killing her, whereupon CúChulainn is able to lift his face from the ground and meet the attack of Crimthann, whom he slays.

8.3 The Italic Warrior

In the Italic form of the tradition, preserved in Propertius's poetic account (4.9.21–74), Hercules/Semo Sancus, in the wake of his heroic victory over the monstrous tricephalic Cacus, has made his way to the trans-*pomerial* space of the Aventine, gripped by *ira* 'rage' (4.9.62) – as

with *furor* (see §5.2.2), a term used equally to denote mantic 'frenzy' (see Silius Italicus *Punica* 1.101). He is overwhelmed by raging, consuming heat, *aestus* (4.9.63); as we shall see, Indra too burns (see §8.6.1) following his slaying of a three-headed foe (see §8.4.1.2.2). Latin *aestus* itself also signifies 'raging anger', as in Silius Italicus's use of the term to name the fury *flammiferae mentis* 'of the fiery mind' of the warrior Athena (*Pun*. 9.476) – as well as 'mental suffering', as in Ovid's *Tristia* 4.3.25.

In his post-combat debilitated state, Hercules/Semo Sancus reaches the entrance to the grove of the goddess Bona Dea; *et iacit ante fores verba minora deo* 'and before the gates he speaks words too small for a god' (4.9.32): like Indra, the Italic *god* has become impotent and small – literally small in Indra's case (shrunken and hidden within a lotus stalk). There the Italic warrior is plainly cautioned by the old priestess who guards the entrance to the grove that he must not enter because within he would see women bathing nude in the stream whose waters he is seeking in order to cool his raging heat (4.9.53–60):

Parce oculis, hospes, lucoque abscede verendo;
cede agedum et tuta limina linque fuga.
interdicta viris metuenda lege piatur
quae se summota vindicat ara casa.
magno Tiresias aspexit Pallada vates,
fortia dum posita Gorgone membra lavat.
di tibi dent alios fontes: haec lympha puellis
avia secreti limitis unda fluit.
Avert your eyes, stranger, and depart this holy grove,
withdraw now and leave its thresholds in safe flight.
Prohibited to men, it is avenged by a law to be feared,
by which the altar in this secluded hut takes its revenge.
At a great price Tiresias the prophet gazed upon Pallas,
while she bathed her strong limbs, her Aegis laid aside.
May the gods give you other springs: these waters for maidens
flow, remote stream of hidden course.

As with CúChulainn approaching the gates of Emain Macha, nude female bodies are about to be revealed to the dysfunctional Italic warrior, and the warrior is warned that there will be a price to pay if his gaze is not averted.

8.3.1 Tiresias and the Unaverted Gaze

Hercules/Semo Sancus is alerted to the consequences of seeing the

bathing women by way of a reference to the fate of the Greek seer Tiresias, who gazed upon Athena nude and was blinded for it. Ps-Apollodorus reports the event succinctly in his *Bibliotheca* (3.6.7), citing Pherecydes (mid-sixth century BC) as his source:

> . . . γυμνὴν ἐπὶ πάντα ἰδεῖν, τὴν δὲ ταῖς χερσὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καταλαβομένην πηρὸν ποιῆσαι.
>
> . . . he saw [her] completely naked, and she blocked his eyes with her hands and maimed him.

Callimachus relates the tale more fully in his *Hymn* 5 (*In lavacrum Palladis*). Tiresias's mother, the nymph Chariclo, was a favorite companion of Athena's. One day as the two, Chariclo and Athena, virgin goddess, bathed in Mt. Helicon's Hippocrenian waters in the quiet of midday, the adolescent Tiresias came upon them and εἶδε τὰ μὴ θεμιτά 'he saw what is not divinely sanctioned' (line 78). An infuriated Athena struck him blind. In shock, his mother Chariclo cried (lines 87–90):

> ὄμματά μοι τῶ παιδὸς ἀφείλεο. τέκνον ἄλαστε,
> εἶδες Ἀθαναίας στήθεα καὶ λαγόνας,
> ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀέλιον πάλιν ὄψεαι. ὢ ἐμὲ δειλάν,
> ὢ ὄρος, ὢ Ἑλικὼν οὐκέτι μοι παριτέ 90
>
> The eyes of my son you've taken away! Wretched child,
> You've seen the breast and lap of Athena;
> But you shall not see the sun again! O miserable me,
> O mount, O Helicon, no longer shall I pass by you[7] 90

By reference to this event, Bona Dea's priestess warns Hercules/Semo Sancus of what lies in store for him should he see the women bathing naked within the grove. The cautionary lesson with which the old woman's admonition is framed, however, is not strictly pertinent: Tiresias was blinded not simply because he saw a naked female body – presumably he saw his mother's body as well; he was blinded because it was a *goddess* that he saw unclothed, and *she* did not will the encounter. He saw τὰ μὴ θεμιτά 'what is not divinely sanctioned': Callimachus characterizes the transgression using the Greek term that we examined earlier, θεμι(σ)τός, translating Latin *fastus*; seeing a goddess so exposed is off-limits to a mortal. Callimachus makes it explicit when he has Athena respond to Chariclo's outcry (5.97–102):

> δῖα γύναι, μετὰ πάντα βαλεῦ πάλιν ὅσσα δι' ὀργάν

εἶπας· ἐγὼ δ᾽ οὔ τοι τέκνον ἔθηκ᾽ ἀλαόν.
οὐ γὰρ Ἀθαναίᾳ γλυκερὸν πέλει ὄμματα παίδων
ἁρπάζειν· Κρόνιοι δ᾽ ὧδε λέγοντι νόμοι·
ὅς κε τιν᾽ ἀθανάτων, ὅκα μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἕληται,
ἀθρήσῃ, μισθῶ τοῦτον ἰδεῖν μεγάλω.

Godly woman, take back all that you in anger
spoke; I am not the one who's made your son blind.
For it's no sweet thing to Athena to snatch away
child-eyes; but the laws of Cronus state:
Whoever shall gaze on some one of the immortals – when that
deity does not so choose – looks at great price.

As recorded by the Alexandrian Ptolomaeus Chennus, the same trope surfaces in a tale of Apollo's son Erymanthus (Καινὴ ἱστορία 1.10–14):[8]

Ἐρύμανθος ὁ παῖς Ἀπόλλωνος ἐτυφλώθη, διότι ἴδοι λουμένην Ἀφροδίτην ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀδώνιδος μίξεως, καὶ Ἀπόλλων μηνίσας ἑαυτὸν εἰς σύαγρον μετεμόρφωσε, καὶ τοῖς ὀδοῦσι πλήξας ἀνεῖλε τὸν Ἄδωνιν.

Erymanthus the son of Apollo was blinded since he reportedly saw Aphrodite bathing after her intercourse with Adonis; and Apollo, enraged, metamorphosed himself into a wild boar, slashed Adonis with his tusks and killed him.

A harsher fate befell Actaeon, grandson of Cadmus, when he saw the virgin Artemis bathing – Actaeon who was changed into a stag for the visual encounter and killed by his own hounds (Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 5.337–341):

ὄλβιε Τειρεσία, σὺ γὰρ ἔδρακες ἐκτὸς ὀλέθρου
γυμνὸν ἀναινομένης οἰκτίρμονος εἶδος Ἀθήνης·
οὐ θάνες, οὐκ ἐλάφοιο δέμας λάχες, οὐδὲ μετώπῳ
ὑμετέρῳ προβλῆτες ἐπῃώρηντο κεραῖαι·
ζώεις σῶν βλεφάρων ὀλέσας φάος·
Happy Tiresias, without destruction you gazed on
the naked form of Athena – spurning – merciful;
you did not die, you did not acquire the body of a stag, no
horny projections rose upon your brow;
if you lost the light from your eyes – still you live.

Callimachus places this very tale of the gazing Actaeon and the nude Artemis on the lips of Athena as she instructs Chariclo on her son's less-lamentable fate: it is, as Claude Calame terms it, "a story-within-a-

story" and perhaps a version of the Actaeon myth created by Callimachus himself for this hymn.[9] The motif is one that has not ceased to find new, re-interpretative expression, as in T. S. Eliot's *The Wasteland* (lines 196–201, influenced by lines penned by John Day in *The Parliament of Bees*[10]):

> But at my back from time to time I hear
> The sound of horns and motors, which shall bring
> Sweeney to Mrs. Porter in the spring.
> O the moon shone bright on Mrs. Porter
> And on her daughter
> They wash their feet in soda water

8.3.1.1 The Roman Appropriation of a Greek Trope.

Propertius – or that popular Italic tradition on which he draws, perhaps the expression of ritual aetiology from his native Umbria – has utilized a familiar Greek trope to re-articulate a primitive element of Indo-European myth: the notion that it is a dangerous thing for a mortal man to gaze upon a goddess nude when she does not will it – τὰ μὴ θεμιτά 'what is not divinely sanctioned' – is appropriated and applied to the dysfunctional warrior's encounter of female nudity in the remote space of the Aventine, an encounter that holds some potential danger for the warrior. The process is fundamentally the same as that by which Greek Heracles has come to stand in for native Semo Sancus in the Italic reflex of this primitive Indo-European tale of the tricephal-slaying hero.[11]

Cicero, in a speech delivered before the pontifical college (*De domo sua*), has this trope in mind when he speaks of humankind having many false notions about life (105). None of the forebears (*maiores*) of those present in his audience, he suggests, had ever insinuated themselves into the secret rites of Bona Dea, not even that one of them who had eventually gone blind. The reference is to Appius Claudius Caecus, Censor in 312 BC, namesake of the Via Appia: . . . *ille, qui nihil viderat sciens quod nefas esset, lumina amisit* '. . . that one who purposely looked upon nothing that is *nefas*, lost the light of his eyes'.[12] On the reputed eroticism of the celebration of the rites of Bona Dea, see §8.6.2.2.

Undoubtedly in the Ur-Roman tale, the hero whose ragings are quenched by cooling waters is witness to female nudity in conjunction with immersion in (or ingestion of) such waters (the stream in which the women bathe in Propertius' account), just as the dissipating of CúChulainn's *ferg* is accomplished by tandem processes involving feminine exhibitionism and submersion within water. But the Italic

warrior does not share the fate of Tiresias: he suffers no permanent loss of vision; as with CúChulainn, the Italic hero Semo Sancus must have surrendered his vision of the moment by averting his gaze. The Greek blinding trope is here a synchronic expression of the diachronic averting-of-the-gaze component of the FEMININE EROTICISM feature of the primitive structural matrix – figuring prominently in the Irish reflex of the Indo-European myth – and surfacing elsewhere, as we shall see. But the appropriation of the Greek trope surely entails more: Tiresias fell victim to the goddess's anger not simply because he saw her nude, but because the goddess saw *him* seeing her nude. It is the reciprocal gaze, the reciprocal cognizance of the viewing, that is crucial. The bathing women in Bona Dea's grove will also have held Hercules/ Semo Sancus within their own gaze, as would the nude women of Emain Macha have fixed their eyes on CúChulainn, issuing the battle challenge for him to look upon their breasts: "*These* are the combatants who will come against you today."[13]

8.4 The Indo-Iranian Warrior

The matrix feature FEMININE EROTICISM will lead us beyond the confines of Indic tradition and into the domain of sibling Iranian expressions (ultimately [and ideally] grounded in common Indo-Iranian expressions) of the Indo-European myth of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior. As we shall see, traditions of the Ossets, descendants of the Scythians and other ancient Iranian peoples of southern Russia, and their non-Indo-European cultural dependents in the Caucasus, provide cognate traditions of the dysfunctional warrior particularly close to those of Ireland and Rome.

8.4.1 The Indic Warrior

An episode of conspicuous feminine nudity that recapitulates the Irish and Italic traditions does not occur in the brief Vedic form of the tradition rehearsed here, but an avatar of this motif of the feminine erotic can be identified in the *Mahābhārata*, where one finds woven through the account of Indra's disappearance an expression of erotic excessiveness and display and its consequence for the viewer. The principal source of this disappearance tradition is *Mahābhārata* 5 (the *Udyogaparvan*); a less-expansive version occurs in Book Twelve (the *Śāntiparvan*), and a description of this episode of excessiveness (bound up with the reign of Nahuṣa [see immediately following]), ancillary to Indra's retreat, is found in Book Thirteen (*Anuśāsanaparvan*).

An Indic parallel to the western Indo-European traditions exists in

this way: while in the Irish and Italic accounts, the lewd element figures conspicuously in conjunction with the cooling of the warrior's debilitating rage and so in his return to a position of effectiveness in society, in India erotic excessiveness plays an integral role in facilitating the rescue of the warrior Indra from a paralyzing state of crisis and restoring him from his watery place of retreat beyond the boundary of society to his position as king of gods – again, a return to a position of effectiveness within society.

8.4.1.1 Nahuṣa and his Gaze.

After Indra flees to "the ends of the world" and the earth is parched by a drought that brings terror to all beings (see §7.2), seers and gods beg a human, the virtuous Nahuṣa, to become king.[14] Nahuṣa declines – he is not sufficiently powerful – but acquiesces when the seers and gods promise to provision him for the task (*Mahābhārata* 5.11.7–8):

> *devadānavayakṣāṇām, ṛṣīṇāṃ, rakṣasāṃ tathā,*
> *pitṛgandhārvabhūtānāṃ cakṣurviṣayavartinām*
> *teja ādāsyase paśyan, balavāṃś ca bhaviṣyasi.*
> When gods, dānavas, yakṣas, seers, rakṣasas,
> Pitaras, gandhārvas, and ghosts pass within your vision field,
> looking at them you will take their *tejas* and become powerful.

By gazing at such beings, Nahuṣa can rob them of their *tejas* and make it his own and, in so doing, gain *balam* 'power': Sanskrit *tejas*, at times simply translated as 'splendor', is "a somewhat vague term . . . but one which always indicates, in opposition to the force of the body [*balam*], a power of the soul."[15] Among other senses, *tejas* can denote 'fiery energy, vital power' (*Atharva Veda* and elsewhere) and 'impatience, fierceness' (*Mahābhārata*).[16] The *tejas*-stealing gaze of Nahuṣa is described as *dṛṣṭiviṣa* 'poison gaze' (5.16.26, 30); it is *sughora* 'truly horrible' (5.16.26). Nahuṣa is called *ghorarūpa* (5.16.30) and *ghoradarśana* 'having a horrible appearance' (5.12.1), as well as *ghoradṛṣṭi* 'having a horrible gaze' (5.16.32). When the gods will seek out the traumatized warrior Indra, hidden in a watery place beyond the boundary, to hymn him, to cause him to regain his strength and to return from beyond the boundary, the divine priest Bṛhaspati, leader of the hymning delegation, will announce to Indra: *mā tvaṃ paśyer Nahuṣaṃ vai kadā cit!* 'Do not ever look at Nahuṣa!', adding that all the gods are running in a hidden form so as not to look upon Nahuṣa (5.16.26). Hiltebeitel is certainly correct when he observes that "Nahuṣa's 'poison sight' seems to require eye contact."[17] It is the reciprocity of the gaze that is crucial.

When Nahuṣa, so endowed with the *tejas*-stealing poisonous gaze, had accepted Indra's throne, he initially continued, in keeping with his former character, to put *dharma* first; but then his *dharmātmā* 'soul characterized by *dharma*' became a *kāmātmā* 'soul characterized by lust' (*Mahābhārata* 5.11.11). The lustful Nahuṣa then surrounds himself with the nymph-like Apsarās and divine maidens – with which feminine creatures he is said to be 'playing around'[18] – *krīḍan* (5.11.13) – a participle with a verb root that clearly denotes 'sexual play' among its usages.[19] They cavort *devodyāneṣu sarveṣu* 'in all the gardens of the gods' and other bucolic spaces.

While Nahuṣa was thus "playing around," Śacī, Indra's wife, came into his gaze, and his lustful soul became obsessed with her. He demands that she immediately come to his *niveśana* 'resting place', term denoting both 'dwelling' and 'bed' (*Mahābhārata* 5.11.16–17). A terrified Śacī goes to Bṛhaspati and begs for protection; Nahuṣa learns of it and is enraged. The gods and preeminent seers go to Nahuṣa and counsel him to dispel his rage and to turn his mind from evil, whereupon Nahuṣa, being *kāmamohita* 'infatuated by desire', reminds the gods of Indra's own sexual dalliance with Ahalya, wife of a seer, and of other such deeds and of their failure to intervene on those occasions. The gods relent and offer to bring Śacī to Nahuṣa, urging him again to relinquish his rage (5.11.20–12.9).

8.4.1.2 Śacī, Upaśruti, and Agni.

With the offer to bring Śacī to Nahuṣa a chain of events is set in motion that will lead to the downfall of Nahuṣa and the return of the traumatized Indra from his place of retreat beyond the boundary, and the restoration of his sovereignty. Following a plan contrived by the divine Brahman Bṛhaspati, and agreed to by the gods, Śacī goes to *Nahuṣaṃ ghoradarśanam* 'Nahuṣa of horrible appearance'. As she approaches, Nahuṣa – *duṣṭātmā, kāmopahatacetanaḥ* 'evil-souled, with a mind afflicted by lust' – gazes (*dṛṣṭvā*) upon her (5.12.31–32). And, continuing to gaze (*dṛṣṭvā*) upon her, Nahuṣa says (5.13.1):

> *trayāṇām api lokānām aham Indraḥ, śucismite,*
> *bhajasva māṃ, varārohe, patitve, varavarṇini.*
> I myself am Indra of the three worlds, brightly smiling woman,
> receive me, lovely-buttocked woman, as a husband, lovely-skinned woman.

But Śacī begs Nahuṣa for more time so that she can discover definitively the fate of her husband, Indra; when that closure has been achieved, she will give herself to Nahuṣa. Her request granted, Śacī

subsequently locates Indra hidden within the lotus stalk with the assistance of a spirit of divination, Upaśruti, to whom we shall return later (frequently within this chapter; see also §9.2.1).[20]

In the account of *Mahābhārata* 5, two alternative narratives – sequentially occurring episodes, as the Epic is presently constructed – are presented of the discovery of Indra within his watery hiding place. Śacī, led by Upaśruti, first finds her husband, shrunk to a tiny size, hidden within the aforementioned stalk of a lotus (5.14.5–12). When Śacī returns to the society of the gods from the hinterlands of Indra's flight, she again meets with Nahuṣa, implanting within his mind an idea that will lead to his undoing, and in this, she is following the counsel she received from hidden Indra (5.15.5–21).

The Epic poets depict Śacī as then urging Bṛhaspati to find Indra quickly, as the period of time before she must give herself to Nahuṣa will soon have expired. Bṛhaspati promises to do so; after kindling a fire, he offers an oblation so that Indra will be found, and then addresses Agni, the fire god – the 'oblation eater' (*hutāśana*), the 'oblation carrier' (*havyavāha*) – who has appeared, telling Agni to seek out Indra. Agni, *strīveṣam adbhutaṃ kṛtvā* 'assuming a womanly form that was a marvel', makes his search in a flash. But his instantaneous exploration – in female form – of (almost) all spaces proves to be fruitless: Agni returns to Bṛhaspati in a moment, telling him that Indra is not to be found anywhere, though naturally enough he has not searched the waters, since, the fire god states, *sadā . . . āpaḥ praveṣṭuṃ notsahāmy aham* 'I myself am always unable to enter the waters'. But prodded with praises and promises of strengthening mantras by the divine Brahman, Agni relents, searches the waters, and finds Indra hidden within the lotus stalk (5.15.23–16.13).

8.4.1.2.1 The Feminine and the Fire.

The structuring of the two alternative discovery narratives as sequential occurrences is self-evidently an example of the poets of the *Mahābhārata* taking full advantage of the available traditions. As Dumézil phrases it, this is "another of those inconsistencies, frequent in Epic narratives, which prove that the poets sought to make use of a variant, precious from other points of view, of what they had already recited"[21] (and see Holtzmann's remarks later). In the first case it is Indra's wife, Śacī, led by the female spirit of divination, Upaśruti, who discovers the hero fled beyond the boundary; in the second it is the divine Fire (Agni) – but an Agni who has taken on female form for the search – a marvelous occurrence! – who makes the discovery: the space of discovery is the same – in a remote watery locale, within the stalk of a lotus.

The element of the feminine and the element of the fire appear to be so deeply engrained in the tradition that they can amalgamate as an Agni in feminine morphology, or otherwise they were already inextricably bound, in one sense or another, in more primitive forms of the tradition. But once this observation has been made, a question immediately presents itself. There are two feminine forms involved in the former account of the search for Indra, each performing a distinct function – Upaśruti, the guiding divinatory spirit, and Śacī, the object of Nahuṣa's erotic desires. With which element of the feminine – the clairvoyant or the erotic – is it that the element of fire can amalgamate? Seeing that the element of fire, Agni, serves as an agent of discovery, one might reasonably be prone to identify the aligned feminine element with the spirit of divination, equally an agent of discovery. Yet in the *Śāntiparvan*, Agni plays no role in the search for Indra; the Agni-quest for Indra of the *Udyogaparvan* is there "replaced" by one in which Śacī alone seeks out the dysfunctional warrior: Agni and Śacī alternate. We will return to this matter and see evidence for the deep antiquity of this amalgamation of feminine and fire when we consider the feature of the clairvoyant woman (see §9.5.1).

As just noted, in contrast to *Mahābhārata* 5 (the *Udyogaparvan*), the account of the *Śāntiparvan* (*Mahābhārata* 12) – while preserving the concatenation of two sequential searches – identifies Śacī as the seeker of Indra in both forays (12.329.29–41). As before, the divining spirit Upaśruti initially leads Śacī to her husband hidden within a lotus stalk, identified as growing within lake Mānasa. The gods and seers then subsequently go in search of the Indra but are unable to find him, whereupon Śacī – not Agni – seeks him out and brings him to the gods. In this account, unlike that of *Mahābhārata* 5, Nahuṣa has experienced his downfall prior to the second search for Indra – Indra is sought out because there is yet once more no king. The feminine element is again essential for the restoration of the warrior-in-crisis; Agni, the fire, appears somewhat less indispensable. Hiltebeitel characterizes the account of *Mahābhārata* 12 as one "that seems to show a hand bent on smoothing out inconsistencies and exalting brahmins."[22]

Regarding the dual accounts of the *Udyogaparvan* (*Mahābhārata* 5), Dumézil[23] lends his support to Holtzmann's confident conjecture that the search conducted by Agni is the more primitive of the two variants; Holtzmann writes:[24]

> Wie Śaci den Indra gefunden habe, darüber gab es zwei verschiedene Überlieferungen; nach der einen, spätern, geschah es mit Hilfe der Upaśruti, d. i. der verkörperten Astrologie und

Zauberei, nach der anderen, früheren, durch den alles durchdringenden Feuergott Agni. Wie an unzähligen Stellen, so sind auch hier die beiden einander ausschließenden Berichte neben einander stehen geblieben: Indra wird zuerst durch Upaśruti gesucht und gefunden, dann nochmals durch Agni. Den Gedanken aber, den Nahuṣa durch Anreizung seines Hochmuthes zu Falle zu bringen, hat Śaci in der älteren Fassung wahrscheinlich selbst gefasst, ehe sie den Indra gesehen; in der jetzigen Fassung giebt ihr Indra, den sie, mit Hilfe der Upaśruti, gesehen und gesprochen, diesen Rath; denn die spätere Überarbeitung entfernte im ganzen Gedichte sorgfältig alle Stellen, in welchen Frauen selbständig denken und handeln. Die ganze Zusammenkunft des Indra mit Śaci ist ein späterer Zusatz.

Concerning how Śacī found Indra, there are two different traditions: according to one – the later – it happened with the help of Upaśruti (i.e. one embodying astrology and sorcery); according to the other – the earlier – through the all-pervading fire god, Agni. As in countless passages, here also two mutually exclusive accounts are positioned next to one another: Indra is first sought and found by Upaśruti – and then once more by Agni. The plan, however, which is hatched to snare Nahuṣa by means of his arrogance, Śacī had in the older version probably devised herself, before seeing Indra; in the attested version, this wily counsel is given to her by Indra, whom she sees and talks to with the help of Upaśruti: later reworking diligently removed – in the whole of the poem – all instances in which women think and act independently. The entire meeting of Indra with Śacī is a later addition.

Hiltebeitel[25] is inclined to follow Dumézil and Holtzmann in this regard, and trying to tease apart Agni's role in the discovery and restoration of Indra from the Nahuṣa-Śacī episode, he mentions in passing *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.6.3.1–17: "In this and other *Brāhmaṇa* references to the Indra cycle, Nahuṣa does not appear."[26] In other words, Hiltebeitel would see Śacī, and Upaśruti, as notionally linked to the Nahuṣa affair in a conspicuous way and Agni to the restoration-of-Indra episode.[27] We should consider this passage from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, but before doing so we need to place the *Mahābhārata* account of the disappearance of Indra in its local Epic context.

8.4.1.2.2 The Epic Context of the Dysfunctional Warrior.

In *Rig Veda* 1.32, Indra performs that heroic act for which he is repeatedly praised in the *Rig Veda* – the slaying of the drought-bringing, cattle-thieving dragon Vṛtra – and then takes flight; I repeat the earlier-cited Vedic couplet here (1.32.14):

aher yātāraṃ kam apaśya indra hṛdi yat te jaghnuṣo bhīr agachat
nava ca yan navatiṃ ca sravantīḥ śyeno na bhīto ataro rajāṃsi

> What avenger of the dragon did you see Indra that fear passed into the heart of you who'd slain him,
>
> That you crossed nine and ninety streams . . . like the frightened eagle you crossed the skies?

In the Epic passages that we have been considering, on the other hand, the crisis that has come upon Indra, which causes him to flee beyond the boundary of society and into a remote watery hiding place, is painted as the consequence of a tandem of acts that the poets have – again – synchronically set in a sequence (see *Mahābhārata* 5.9.2–10.46). The first is the killing of Viśvarūpa (or Triśiras 'three-headed'), the tricephalic son of Tvaṣṭṛ (the smith god), an Indic expression of a primitive Indo-European tradition, of which the Vedic account of the slaying of the monster dubbed Vṛtra 'resistance' is clearly an alternative expression (in some accounts, the murder of the tricephal is committed for Indra by Trita Āptya; see §8.7.2).[28] Viśvarūpa is a Brahmin among the gods, but at the same time, a threat to divine order: he openly promised offerings to the gods, but secretly directed them to the *asuras* (demons; see *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 2.5.1). Even so, his slaying is viewed as a sinful act – that of brahmanicide. The second – ensuing – act is indeed the slaying of the dragon Vṛtra: the Epic poets are again, as with the two Indra-discovery episodes, making full use of variant reportings. But it is a particular account of that heroic dragon slaying that the poets present, one that has been amalgamated with the tale of Indra's underhanded homicide of the demon Namuci, Indra's former enemy with whom the warrior god concluded a pact of friendship, only to annul that truce by deceitfully decapitating Namuci.[29]

The concatenation of the two variant accounts – the killing of Viśvarūpa/Triśiras and the slaying of Vṛtra – is not unique to the *Mahābhārata*. Consider Dumézil's remarks, which address the "logical sequence" seen in the Epic passages we are examining:[30]

> The Brāhmaṇic tradition has not established a regular connection between the Tricephal and Namuci episodes: each is often recited on its own. Nevertheless, certain texts do declare a logical sequence: in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* account . . . (12.7.1–9 and 10–13), if Namuci can strip his "friend" Indra of his powers, it is because Indra has previously been enfeebled by Tvaṣṭṛ, the Tricephal's father, who sought to avenge his son. In a number of Epic and Purāṇic versions of the second episode, Indra's victim sometimes keeps the name Namuci, sometimes receives that of Vṛtra.[31] In the latter case, the conflict is very frequently presented as a logical consequence, even more direct, of the Tricephal's defeat: enraged at the murder of his son, Tvaṣṭṛ engenders or magically creates Vṛtra, a very powerful being, to avenge him, and it is with Vṛtra that Indra concludes the pact, the same pact as with Namuci, often enriched with new, colorful clauses that he gets around in the same manner.

And this "logical consequence" is one that is employed in *Mahābhārata* 5 for setting out the cause of the warrior Indra's state and his flight beyond the boundary.

A similar "logical connection" of the two acts is forged in the aforementioned passage from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 1.6.3.1–17 (that text noted by Hiltebeitel; see the end of the preceding section). Here, after Indra has slain Viśvarūpa, an enraged Tvaṣṭṛ prepares a Soma offering from which he excludes Indra. By force, the uninvited Indra consumes the Soma anyway. With his rage augmented by Indra's insinuating himself into the rite, Tvaṣṭṛ takes the remaining prepared Soma and lets it run into the sacrificial fire, which consequently acquires a form, said to be possessed by Agni and Soma and various attributes, evolving into Vṛtra. When Indra confronts the monster, he calls out to Agni and Soma, declaring that they should forsake Vṛtra and join him; they are persuaded to do so when Indra offers sacrificial cakes to them – and along with Agni and Soma come "all the gods" and the various attributes that had gone into Vṛtra – and thus Indra becomes what "Indra is now." Indra then dispatches Vṛtra.

8.4.1.2.3 Composition and Recomposition.

The preceding excursion into the Brāhmaṇic tradition of Indra's slaying of Viśvarūpa and Vṛtra reveals the presence of an Agnic element at a crucial ontogenic moment in the dossier of Indra the dragon slayer. And as Hiltebeitel has pointed out, it is a tradition from which the Nahuṣa episode is excluded. Does this mean, per Holtzmann, that "the entire meeting of Indra with Śacī is a later

addition"?[32] Does this mean, per Dumézil, following Holtzmann, that "the 'quest' of Fire, on the order of Bṛhaspati, is the older form of the episode, and that the 'quest' of Upaśruti, connected with the story of Nahuṣa, is a retouched version"?[33]

Such judgments of relative chronology are circumscribed by the subset of time within which they are relevant. The *Mahābhārata* is the product of myriad accretions through centuries of ongoing oral recomposition in performance. To claim that within the compositional and performance history of the *Mahābhārata* the "Agni quest" for Indra appeared earlier than the "Śacī quest" would not be the same as to claim that the Śacī tradition is in some sense derivative. It would also be a very difficult claim to verify or to assess in a meaningful way: it would be in effect a meaningless claim. The comparative evidence unmistakably reveals that the tales of the Indo-European dragon-slaying warrior, the tales of the warrior-in-crisis and retreat, constitute common Indo-European tradition: the Ur-tradition lying behind the "two quests" for Indra long antedates Indic Epic, in which *both* quests appear for the first time in the Sanskrit literary record. To tease apart the twin quests for Indra by fire and by woman as more and less primitive, respectively, is also to ignore the evidence of the recorded tradition of the principal source, *Mahābhārata* 5: even the search conducted by fire is a search in which the form of the searcher, Agni, is that of a woman (5.15.29):

> *tasmāc ca bhagavān devaḥ svayam eva hutaśanaḥ*
> *strīveṣam adbhutaṃ kṛtvā, tatraivantaradhīyata.*
> And hence appeared the blessed god himself, the oblation eater
> and assuming a womanly form that was a marvel, then immediately departed.

And of course in the *Śāntiparvan* (Book Twelve) it is Śacī who conducts both the first and second search, led initially by the spirit of divination, Upaśruti.

8.4.2 The Armenian Warrior

This is not to say, however, that there is *no evidence* for the epic restructuring of an inherited tradition – such restructuring is obvious, and what one would fully expect, and to this I shall return later. This is also not to suggest that there is *no pre-Indic evidence* for the role of fire in the recovery of the slayer of Vṛtra from a watery space. The Armenian historian Moses of Chorene (Movsēs Khorenac'i; traditionally assigned to the fifth century AD) preserves in his *History of the Armenians* (1.31) a short song of the god Vahagn (a principal

deity of pre-Christian Armenia[34]): “The Song of the Birth of Vahagn is the oldest testimony of Armenian literature”; “Despite the Middle Iranian loans, these are probably the oldest words spoken in Armenian which we shall ever hear”;[35] “It is the only mythological Armenian text to survive to the present day.”[36]

8.4.2.1 Vahagn: an Iranian Borrowing.

The name of the god, Vahagn, transparently belongs to the set filled out by Sanskrit Vṛtrahan ‘slayer of Vṛtra’ – epithet, most especially, of Indra – and its Avestan counterpart Vərəθraɣna (Pahlavi Vahrām/ Bahrām), the great shape-shifting Mazdean hero of *Yašt* 14.[37] The Armenian name is borrowed from Iranian[38] along with some of the vocabulary of the song[39] and undoubtedly, despite the primacy of the song within Armenian literary history, the germ traditions about Vahagn are also of Iranian origin.

According to Moses of Chorene (1.31), he had himself heard the performance of this song, sung to the playing of an instrument[40] – and Moses is a witness too to singing about the god’s victories over dragons and other exploits that he characterizes as redolent of Heracles’ own. Here is the song:[41]

erknēr erkin, erknēr erkir,
erknēr ew covn cirani.
erkn i covown ownēr
ew zkarmrikn eɫegnik.
ənd eɫegan pʻoɫ cowx elanēr,

ənd eɫegan pʻoɫ bocʻ elanēr.
ew i bocʻoyn vazēr xarteaš patanekik.
na howr her ownēr,
bocʻ ownēr mōrows,
ew ačʻkownkʻn ēin aregakownkʻ.
In labor was heaven, in labor was earth,
and in labor was the purple sea.
The birth pangs in the sea grasped
too the small red reed.
Along the stalk of the reed smoke arose,
along the stalk of the reed flame arose.
And out of the flame leapt a small red-headed young man.
He had fire hair,
he had flame moustaches,
and his little eyes were suns.

Long ago, Dumézil[42] recognized that the Armenian Song of Vahagn preserves an Iranian tradition common to that of the emerging of Indra, the Vṛtrahan, from his watery hiding place within the stalk of a lotus in Sanskrit Epic. In a later work he sums up in this way:[43]

> The most straightforward attitude, the one most respectful of the materials, is not to assume the convergence of two late and independent fantasies; rather, it is to suppose that Iranicized Armenia has transmitted to us a form of Vərəθraγna, still closely resembling his Indo-Iranian prototype which, free of the requirements of the moralizing theology of Mazdaism, was enabled to survive for a long time in more than one part of Iran, just as the *itihāsa*, the source for the Epic traditions, may have conserved the same material in India, outside the Vedic literature.

The sameness of the two traditions is evident enough, if – given my identification of the tradition of the Indo-European warrior-in-crisis – I frame the similarities in a way that departs somewhat from Dumézil's own interpretative analysis. A miniature Indra hides within the stalk of a lotus in a remote lake, traumatized following his defeat of Vṛtra. The society that he has fled is gripped by panic and terror. The earth (*bhūmi*), in contrast to the god's aqueous hiding place, is beset by drought – streams diminish, standing waters dry up. Creation is chaotically overwhelmed in Indra's absence, being without its *rāj-* (Latin *rēx*) (*Mahābhārata* 5.10.49):

> *arājakaṃ jagat sarvam abhibhūtam upadravaiḥ*
> the entire kingless world was overcome by calamities

At the summoning of the divine priest Bṛhaspati, Agni – the Fire, instantaneously searches the world: the cardinal regions and the in-between regions, the mountains and the forests, the earth and the sky (*diśaḥ pradiśaś caiva, parvatāni vanāni ca, pṛthivīṃ cantarikṣaṃ ca*; 5.15.30–31), and, upon further coaxing, the waters. From those waters Indra will be extracted – with Fire the catalyst that has facilitated the extraction – as Bṛhaspati, accompanied by gods and seers, hymns Indra (see §7.5) – rehearsing his dragon-slaying ventures and other exploits. Indra arises from within the lotus stalk (5.16.19):

> *evaṃ saṃstūyamānaś ca sovardhata śanaiḥ śanaiḥ,*
> *svaṃ caiva vapur āsthāya babhūva sa balānvitaḥ.*
> thus extolled he grew – slowly and slowly –
> and when he had risen up to his own form he became power-filled.

In the Armenian Song of Vahagn, the world – heaven, earth, sea – is depicted as being in the throes of labor – which grips equally the small red reed within the sea. In an eruption of fire, out of the reed stalk bursts a tiny, fiery Vahagn, like the tiny Indra Vṛtrahan rising from the lotus stalk within a great lake of an island within the sea, found out by all-pervasive Fire. The Armenian song is typically construed as rehearsing the birth of Vahagn – which characterization is easy enough to understand – though Moses does not himself characterize the song as a birth narrative: he tells his readers that the heroic figure Tigran had three sons (Pap, Tiran, and Vahagn), presents the lines from the Song of Vahagn, refers to the oral performance of Vahagn's dragon-slaying and Herculean exploits, and then goes on to identify his descendants.

8.4.2.2 Fire and the Feminine.

One might wonder if in the performance tradition from which Moses' song is excised, the labor of heaven, earth, and sea was understood to be metaphorical – creation is, as it were, in travail as it awaits the emergence of Vahagn from the reed – not so unlike the cosmic conditions described in *Mahābhārata* 5.10.45–49: the gods quake with terror, the earth is parched, the lakes dry up, and creation is overwhelmed as Indra lies hidden within the lotus stalk. For a similar birth metaphor from antiquity one might compare – without any suggestion of historical connection – St. Paul's description of the created world, ἡ κτίσις, and its longing for the revelation of the sons of God and its release ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς 'from the bondage of dissolution' (Romans 8:22–23):

> οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν· οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.
>
> For we know that all the created world collectively groans and labors with birth pangs right up to the present day, but also those having the first-fruits of the spirit – we – us – groan within ourselves, eagerly awaiting adoption, the redemption of the body.

Consider too that in Greek antiquity, childbirth is notionally linked to fire and a state of mania.[44] Pausanias describes a wood and marble statue of Eileithyia (goddess of childbirth) in her sanctuary at Aegeum; she holds in one hand a torch, and, Pausanias comments (7.23.6):

Εἰλειθυίᾳ δὲ εἰκάσαι τις ἂν εἶναι δᾷδας, ὅτι γυναιξὶν ἐν ἴσῳ καὶ πῦρ εἰσιν αἱ ὠδῖνες . . . .

One imagines that torches are associated with Eileithyia because birth pangs are just like fire for women . . . .

– undoubtedly an ancient expression of the phenomenon of labor now popularly known as the "ring of fire." Loraux observes that "at least one passage from *Hippolytus* suggests that childbirth is another form of insanity";[45] the passage to which she refers is one in which Euripides places these words on the lips of the chorus of women of Troezen (161–164):

φιλεῖ δὲ τᾷ δυστρόπῳ γυναικῶν
ἁρμονίᾳ κακὰ
δύστανος ἀμηχανία συνοικεῖν
ὠδίνων τε καὶ ἀφροσύνας.

With women's ill-fashioned
harmony usually dwells
the base unhappy helplessness
of birth pangs and delirium.

Loraux rehearses other examples of the articulation of "childbirth and madness" in tragedy (and in medical diagnosis alike[46]), including the instance of Aeschylus's *Choephoroi* 211: as Electra examines hair and footprints – traces of her brother Orestes – she is overcome by ὠδὶς καὶ φρενῶν καταφθορά (literally) 'pangs and ruin of the mind'. Loraux observes: "It is a metaphor, people say, and hurry to domesticate the contentious word beneath a decent translation . . . . Still, the association of the two semantic fields of madness and childbirth, even in metaphor, would be noteworthy."[47] Associations of childbirth and psychological disturbance continue to be attested to the present day.[48] Perhaps the *birth metaphor* of the Song of Vahagn, if that is what it is, in much the same way is an expression of the delirium that possesses creation as the heroic god lies dormant within a reed of the sea, about "to be born." The Iranian-inspired Armenian song would again be not far from the Sanskrit Epic, with its description of the hysteria that attends Indra's disappearance, prior to his recovery.

8.4.3 The Nart Warrior

In conjunction with this comparative investigation of Indic and Iranian lore, however, mention must be made of a heroic account in which an actual birth event does figure conspicuously; while this birth episode may have little bearing on the Vahagn/Vṛtrahan parallels just

considered, it is nonetheless generally relevant to themes here under investigation. Dumézil and others have drawn attention to the Iranian traditions that have survived in the Nart Epic cycle of the Caucasus, "the last great European epic still alive and flourishing."[49] The Ossetes of the central Caucasus are the modern-day descendants of ancient Iranian peoples – Scythians and Sarmatians; among the Nart traditions that the Ossetes preserve is the tale of the birth of the great warrior Batraz, which tradition Dumézil, in his study of the warrior facing the "triple enemy," notes to show a particular likeness to the Irish account of the cooling of the *ferg* of CúChulainn.[50]

8.4.3.1 The Scythian Ares.

Batraz appears to be the Ossetic reflex of that deity referenced by Herodotus (4.62) in his report of Scythian rites performed for "Ares" – a god that uniquely finds iconic expression among the Scythians (4.59), being given the form of ἀκινάκης σιδήρεος ἀρχαῖος 'an ancient iron sword [of the Persian type]' (καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τοῦ Ἄρεος τὸ ἄγαλμα 'and this is [their] image of Ares'; 4.62).[51] After describing the customary sacrificial practices and victims of the Scythians, Herodotus notes that the sacrifices made to this Ares are of a distinctive nature. Each *nomos* of each chiefdom has within it a site sacred to Ares that contains bundles of firewood stacked nine *stadia* square (three by three) and of somewhat more modest height, with a top that is worked level and one side that can be ascended. On top of these massive structures of firewood, which must be built up annually with 150 wagonloads of wood (as the structures settle under the weight of winter storms), the iron-sword image of the warrior god is installed; to that image, annual sacrifices of cattle and horses are brought – more than to other gods – as well as offerings of the blood of one percent of all war captives, who are sacrificed by having their throats slit, and are partially dismembered (their right arms being cut off [by the ground of the sacred site] and tossed into the air, landing where they may). The Scythian god's fiery potentialities and his iron morphology, even the heights of his sacred sites, reverberate in the birth narrative and adventures of the Nart warrior Batraz (see immediately following).

With regard to this sacred architecture of Scythian Ares, consider too the Ossetic account of the death of Batraz, which Charachidzé summarizes in this way (citing Dumézil 1995:1:573 for the quote):[52]

> . . . seized by an incessant murderous rage, he [i.e. Batraz] terrorized the Nart countryside, slaughtering his own people and submitting them to more and more atrocious tortures. Finally,

> weary of life, he decided to die and ordered the Narts to build a huge pyre made of one hundred cartloads of calcined trees, with six pairs of bellows at each corner. He climbed onto the blazing fire, and when his steel body got white-hot, he danced and twirled his sword, cutting off the heads and arms of the Narts who were working the twenty-four bellows.
>
> But he stayed alive, because he could not die until his sword fell into the sea. He laid it down on the fire, and the Narts had it dragged away to the Black Sea by a team of two hundred horses. They pushed it into the water, and Batraz finally died in the midst of a great storm. "The sword is still in the sea, the Ossets think, and when they see lightning in the western sky, they attribute the flash to Batraz's sword leaping from the sea toward the sky."

These are by now familiar landmarks: the dysfunctional warrior who, possessed by maniacal rage, presents a danger to his own society; submersion of the warrior – in this case his iconic image – within water; the fiery dispositions of the warrior; emergence of the warrior from the watery locale – and even a cessation of the warrior's earthly existence in the midst of a violent storm.

8.4.3.2 The Birth of Batraz.

But before the death of Batraz comes his birth. In Ossetic tradition,[53] Batraz was born from the body of his father, Xæmyts.[54] The Nart hero Xæmyts had met his wife as he hunted in a far away remote locale; she dwelt beneath the sea, a descendant of the sea deity Donbettyr, or otherwise a sea-genie – a very small frog-like creature whom Xæmyts would carry protected in his pocket during the day, but who would become a beautiful woman by night. By the scheming of the evil Nart Syrdon,[55] Xæmyts's wife is offended – and it had been fated that such an event would cause her to leave her husband and be reunited with her own marine family. Before she disappears she reveals to Xæmyts that she is pregnant, and she implants the embryo that she is carrying into her husband's body – placing it between his shoulders in the form of an abscess.

When the time arrives for the child to be born from Xæmyts's back, his sister, Satana, takes the expectant father to the top of a tower seven-stories high; there she lances the abscess with a steel blade and out falls the babe Batraz in flames ("Un feu rouge passe devant ses yeux : c'est un petit garçon au corps d'acier brûlant qui jaillit . . . ."[56]), dropping into seven cauldrons of water placed at the base of the tower,[57] passing from one to another. These waters, however, are insufficient. Still burning, Batraz calls out for more cooling liquid so

that his fiery steel will be tempered. In a variant account, Batraz does not need water for tempering but for quenching a fire within that consumes him.[58] Satana goes out to a spring for more water; in order to draw from the spring, and so provide relief for the neophyte warrior's fiery trauma, she must first have sexual intercourse with an oppressive agent – a seven-headed dragon or the devil. By her copulation, the newly born hero's trauma of raging fire is eliminated: the warrior is delivered. Such is the Ossetic birth narrative of this fulgural[59] Iranian warrior. Following his childhood, Batraz leaves the society of the Narts to live either in heaven with the divine smith Kurdalægon or beneath the water with the people of the sea deity Donbettyr, his maternal family, periodically returning to Nart society, at times to turn his rage murderously against the Narts.[60]

This Ossetic Nart Epic episode recounting the cooling of the fire of Batraz is a particular instantiation in the Caucasus of the Iranian reflex of the primitive Indo-European tradition of the traumatized warrior – in this instance, unmistakably a birth trauma (and the mingling of notions of the sufferings of war and those of childbirth is otherwise well-known[61]). Indo-European themes and motifs that surface in the Ossetic tales have been highly productive, spreading to the Nart Epic traditions of non-Indo-European peoples of the Caucasus.[62] In addition to the variants of this particular birth narrative alluded to here, quite different accounts of the birth of the warrior Batraz are attested among the Northwest Caucasian neighbors of the Ossets.

8.4.3.2.1 The Birth of Bataraz in Circassian Tradition.

In Circassian tradition,[63] the Nart Bataraz or Pataraz (Ossetic Batraz)[64] is son of Khimish.[65] One day while hunting, this Nart warrior Khimish meets and is befriended by a dwarf hunter. Journeying with the dwarf to his home, Khimish meets the dwarf's daughter there: they fall in love, and the daughter agrees to marry Khimish, but only upon the condition that he never speak a certain degrading phrase to her; should such degrading words be uttered, she will leave him immediately and return forever to her own family. All went well until a certain occasion when Khimish was impatient for his wife to prepare provisions before he set out on a journey: he grew angry at her slowness and chastised her with the very words that she had told him he must never utter to her. She prepares the food, Khimish departs on his journey, and the dwarf-wife leaves for her family home – never to return to her husband.

8.4.3.2.2 The Death of Khimish in Circassian Tradition and the Rage of Bataraz.

At the time of Khimish's departure, his wife was pregnant with their son – Bataraz. That child will not be raised by his mother, but is given into the care of a clairvoyant foster mother.[66] Bataraz will likewise never know his father Khimish, who dies at the time of the son's birth – murdered by one Maruquo, a Nart jealous of Khimish's warrior prowess.[67] Bataraz's vengeance on the Narts for the spilling of his father's blood constitutes a core element of the Northwest Caucasian Nart tradition.[68] In the Bzhedukh (West Circassian) account reported by Colarusso,[69] however, Khimish's murder has a rather different motivation:

> Nart Khimish was a handsome man. When the wives of the Narts started to cast their eyes after him, the Narts thought that he was not to be trusted with their wives. So they came to discuss whether Khimish should be killed. After a long debate, they decided to kill him. Since Khimish was bulletproof, he could not be shot easily. Therefore, they went to a fortune-teller.

Here it is not the treachery of Maruquo but the lustful gaze of the Nart women – trained upon the warrior Khimish – that will bring about this hero's demise. And a clairvoyant woman will facilitate the discovery of the means by which his destruction will be realized. We shall soon look to this variant account again.

But – to return to the tradition in which Khimish is slain by the villainous Maruquo[70] – Bataraz will in time encounter this killer of his father and will avenge that murder, slaying Maruquo in combat.[71] The rage of Bataraz then turns against the Narts. After many are killed, the Narts consult a sorceress, who reveals to them what they must do: the men should arrange themselves into one row, and the women and infants into a second row; when Bataraz attacks, the men should suddenly move out of the way, exposing the line of women to Bataraz, who will then flatter him and implore him to take pity on them. This happens, and Bataraz responds by naming numerous seemingly impossible tasks that must be fulfilled by the Narts in order for the blood price to be paid.[72] Eventually Bataraz's drive for vengeance dissipates.[73]

In a Bzhedukh account reported by Dumézil,[74] the death of Maruquo, the murderer of Khimish, will itself be avenged in a cycle of blood feuding by Maruquo's own relatives. Pataraz cannot be pierced by projectiles – so how to kill him? Following the guidance of an advisor, the relatives go to the foster mother of Pataraz and trick her into revealing that he is invincible so long as she does not gaze upon him at the same moment that he is hit by a projectile.[75] Armed with

this information, the avengers of Maruquo lay a trap for Pataraz: when he has returned home and fallen asleep, his assailants create a great commotion that awakens Pataraz; he runs out of his house and into a barrage of arrows; his foster mother was also awakened by the sound, and as she looks to see what is happening, her gaze falls fatally upon Pataraz.

The very same stratagem appears in the Bzhedukh account of the murder of the warrior Khimish, father of Pataraz, that was just referred to (and recorded by Colarusso).[76] The Narts who conspire to kill Khimish because their wives have begun to look lustfully upon him learn from the "fortune-teller" whom they consult that if he is pierced by an arrow while his mother is gazing upon him, he will die. In this account, the Narts tie Khimish to a chair while he is asleep and then make enough noise to wake him suddenly. In a state of confusion he runs out of his house, still tied to the chair, heading toward his mother's house. At the same time, his mother exits from her house, having heard the commotion, running to see if her son is safe. As they run towards one another, an archer, lying in wait, shoots and kills Khimish. The feminine gaze is again fatal to the warrior, rendering him susceptible to the ministrations of death.

8.4.4 The Erotic Feminine in Indo-Iranian Tradition

The Nart Epic cycle of the Caucasus unmistakably preserves a complex of elements that we have found to recur in the Indo-European myth of the traumatized warrior. Notable among these is the feature FEMININE EROTICISM.

8.4.4.1 Iranian Satana.

Thus, in the Iranian (i.e., Ossetic) tradition of the birth of fiery Batraz and the taming of his fire, there exists, in the person of Satana, a conspicuous element of feminine sexuality – one reminiscent of the erotic feminine displays of the Irish and Italic traditions that are bound up with alleviating the burning rages that possess CúChulainn and Hercules/Semo Sancus following their respective triumphs. More than that, Ossetic Satana's use of copulation to gain the solution to the warrior's trauma (the water required for his cooling/tempering) is fully parallel to the solution exercised by the Roman Tutula and her slave-women followers to deliver Rome's debilitated warrior band in the aetiological account of the *Nonae Caprotinae* (see §8.7.1). Satana, who is commonly the sexually charged woman in Nart tradition, bears

a complex similarity to the cool-minded Tutula, components of which can be seen in Colarusso's characterization of the Nart figure:[77]

> She is simultaneously a figure of beauty, eternal youth, passion and lust, devotion and treachery. She is the embodiment of profound wisdom and intelligence, while also being a sorceress and seeress. She is often within the same myth both a victim, usually of rape or seduction, while at the same time a manipulator and victimizer.

The motif of feminine eroticism and its power *vis-à-vis* the warrior echoes also in the Bzhedukh tradition of the demise of Khimish, father of Pataraz: it is the collective lust of the Nart wives for Khimish that brings about that hero's demise (see §8.4.3.2.2).

8.4.4.2 Indic Śacī.

In contrast to the Ossetic case – but a contrast that preserves the structural integrity of the Indo-European tradition – what one finds in the Indic account is a certain reversal of the dynamic of Satana and the rescue of the neophyte warrior Batraz from his traumatized state. Unlike Satana, Śacī, spouse and lover of the dysfunctional warrior Indra, principal female figure in this Epic episode, does not immediately seek to exploit erotic potentialities; she tries instead to evade a sexual encounter with Nahuṣa – that force that is oppressing divine society in her husband's absence – as Indra lies hidden in a traumatized state following his slaying of the dragon. It is instead Nahuṣa, the traumatized warrior's "replacement," the un-Indra that is presenting himself as the menace to society, who is the erotic aggressor (*Mahābhārata* 5.12.32):

> *dṛṣṭvā tāṃ Nahuṣaś cāpi vayorūpasamanvitām,*
> *samahṛṣyata duṣṭātmā, kāmopahatacetanaḥ*
> and Nahuṣa, gazing upon her – youthful – beautifully formed –
> he, evil-souled, with a mind afflicted by lust, was aroused

While Satana readily employs copulation as a means of effecting the delivery of the traumatized hero, Śacī stalls, telling Nahuṣa she needs time to determine the nature of Indra's fate and promising that once she has done so – or if it should turn out that Indra's fate cannot be determined – she will then give herself to Nahuṣa.[78] It is this sexual aggressiveness displayed by Nahuṣa that leads directly to the discovery of Indra, as a despairing Śacī, longing to remain *ekabhartṛtva* ('one-husbanded'; 5.13.24), turns to worship the goddess

Night and thence encounters Upaśruti, the spirit of divination, who leads Śacī to her husband hiding within a lotus stalk in a remote, watery space. This discovery, in turn, will lead to the downfall of Nahuṣa and Indra's return to society. Though the gender geometry is reversed relative to an erotic display, conspicuous eroticism facilitates the resolution of the warrior's crisis in the Indic Epic tradition no less than in the Irish, Italic, and Ossetic accounts – and in Roman ritual aetiology. Again – a certain structural integrity is maintained across the traditions, if the structural units exchange positions.

8.4.4.2.1 Nahuṣa and the Unaverted Gaze.

This shift in the gender of the moving force of the erotic is but one feature of alternant geometry in the account of the warrior's flight beyond the boundary in Indic Epic: the affiliated gaze is another. CúChulainn averts his gaze, turning away from the lewd displays of the naked women of Ulster. Hercules/Semo Sancus is forewarned of the danger of looking upon the nude women bathing in the waters of Bona Dea's Aventine grove; and the invocation of the fate of Tiresias – a fate that Hercules does not share – must signal – must stand as a Romanized trace of – the averting of the warrior's gaze in the ancestral Italic tradition as well. The gaze is no less conspicuous and crucial in the *Mahābhārata* account of the restoration of the traumatized and dysfunctional hero, but it is not the *averted* gaze of the post-traumatic hero – it is the *unaverted* gaze of Nahuṣa, the post-traumatic hero's stand-in. The righteous Nahuṣa had been unwilling to be made king following Indra's disappearance because he believed he lacked sufficient power; but, as we saw in §8.4.1.1, he was persuaded when the gods and seers promised to grant him the boon of being able to absorb the *tejas* – 'fiery energy', 'fierceness'– of other beings – gods, dānavas, yakṣas, seers, rakṣasas, Pitaras, gandhārvas, ghosts – any upon whom his gaze might fall (*Mahābhārata* 5.11.7–8). So equipped, Nahuṣa, possessed by lust and hunger for power, becomes a threat to the well-being of society.

While Nahuṣa – the self-styled "Indra of the three worlds" – increases in *balam* 'power' as he robs others of their *tejas*, the post-traumatic hero Indra, fled beyond the boundary of society, has himself lost his *tejas*: when Śacī, led by Upaśruti to her husband's remote place of retreat, implores Indra to destroy Nahuṣa, and thereby save her from his lecherous intentions, she confronts Indra with the imperative *tejaḥ samāpnuhi* 'recover *tejas*!' (5.14.18). And when Agni subsequently leads Bṛhaspati to Indra, that divine Brahmin, performing his enunciative act of recovery, addresses Indra with the imperative – *balam āpnuhi* 'gain *balam*!'. Indra languishes in the

dysfunctional-warrior state of societal avoidance, while his stand-in Nahuṣa embodies the dysfunctional-warrior state of the societal menace.

As mentioned in §8.4.1.1, Hiltebeitel notes that Nahuṣa's stealing of another's *tejas* "seems to require eye contact."[79] When Bṛhaspati travels to Indra's liminal space to hymn the god back into action, he warns Indra *mā tvaṃ paśyer Nahuṣaṃ vai kadā cit!* 'Do not ever look at Nahuṣa!'; the language is emphatic. Bṛhaspati continues, saying that all the gods are running, hidden, so that they will not look at (*na paśyante*) Nahuṣa: all the gods must avoid being active visual agents (*Mahābhārata* 5.16.26). If the two priestly figures – Indic and Italic – occupy reversed geographical perspectives and functional roles (and opposing genders),[80] Bṛhaspati's prohibitive (*mā tvaṃ paśyer Nahuṣaṃ*) is, *mutatis mutandis*, that of the old priestess of Bona Dea (*parce oculis*), addressed to Hercules/Semo Sancus as he stands at the boundary of remote space (Propertius 4.9.53–54, 57–58):

Parce oculis, hospes, lucoque abscede verendo;
cede agedum et tuta limina linque fuga.
. . .
magno Tiresias aspexit Pallada vates,
fortia dum posita Gorgone membra lavat.
Avert your eyes, stranger, and depart this holy grove,
withdraw now and leave its thresholds in safe flight.
. . .
At a great price Tiresias the prophet gazed upon Pallas,
while she bathed her strong limbs, her Aegis laid aside.

And in the account of the reign of Nahuṣa found in the *Anuśāsanaparvan*, Nahuṣa is finally overthrown when the divine seer Bhṛgu curses him and turns him into a snake: even though Bhṛgu possessed such power, he had been careful not to gaze upon Nahuṣa prior to his downfall (*Mahābhārata* 13.103.18).

8.4.4.2.2 Śacī and the Unaverted Gaze.

Śacī, however – the chief object of Nahuṣa's erotic desire – does not succumb to his evil eye-to-eye oppressive gaze: "It is never stated that she is immune to his glance, but it is clear that she is unaffected."[81] More than that, Nahuṣa's own downfall comes about as a direct consequence of Śacī *saṃprāptā darśanaṃ* 'having entered his gaze'. That lustful gaze will send Śacī in search of her husband Indra, discovered by Upaśruti. Indra, who believes that Nahuṣa is too powerful to be overthrown by might (*balam*), counsels Śacī in the

means by which she can be the catalyst of his demise. Śacī then returns to Nahuṣa to implement the scheme: she implants in Nahuṣa's mind the idea that he should distinguish himself by being transported about – by being brought to her – on a palanquin that is carried by seers, rather than being conducted by draft animals, assuring him that when he does so, she will willingly submit herself to him (*Mahābhārata* 5. 15.1–20). And it is at this moment that Śacī does in fact exploit erotic potentialities to bring about a resolution of the warrior-crisis: not actively in the way of Tutula, Satana, the 'scandalous' Scannlach, or the breast-flaunting wife of Conchobor, Mugain (or Férach), but medially and obliquely, by dangling the promise of sex like a carrot on a stick before the gaze of Nahuṣa, who is *kāmopahatacetanas*, one 'with a mind afflicted by lust'. The arrogant Nahuṣa puts this plan into action; his contemptuous treatment of the sages, kicking one (Agastya) in the head, will effect his downfall and his transformation into a snake (*Mahābhārata* 5.17.1–19).[82]

8.4.4.3 Brahmahatyā.

There is, however, yet another expression of feminine eroticism that the poets of the *Mahābhārata* weave into the account of the traumatized warrior Indra in Books Five and Twelve. As mentioned earlier (see notes in §8.4.1.2), this Indra-in-retreat offers the sacrifice of a horse, the rite called the Aśvamedha, cognate in its particulars to the Roman Equus October;[83] in conjunction with the offering, he is rid of his sin of brahmanicide (the murder of the divine Brahmin Viśvarupa [or Triśiras], the tricephalic son of Tvaṣṭṛ, see §8.4.1.2.2) – that sin being distributed over several distinct elements. According to the account of the *Udyogaparvan*, it is disseminated among trees, rivers, mountains, earth, and women (5.13.16–19).

In the *Śāntiparvan* (see 12.273), the narrating of this portioning out of the brahmanicide of Indra takes a form that has the appearance of being a more archaic version, and one that is particularly of interest in light of the findings that have been presented here. When Indra slays Vṛtra, there emerges out of the monster's body a feminine personification of brahmanicide, Brahmahatyā,[84] a horrifying and hideous female creature who then stalks Indra. In his comparative study of Indra and Tullus Hostilius, Allen draws attention to Brahmahatyā and to salient aspects of her appearance (emphasis in the following quote is my own): "Brahmahatyā is disheveled, her gaze dreadful (*prakīrṇamūrdhajā caiva ghoranetrā ca* [12.273.11])."[85] Eventually *dṛṣṭvā śakraṃ mahaujasam* 'seeing Śakra [Indra] of great vigor' (12.273.15) as he, the Vṛtrahan, makes his way on a journey, she catches him off guard; she grabs him and *sulagnā cābhavat tadā* 'and from then on she was dogging him/latched on to him' (12.273.15). It was then that Indra fled and hid in the lotus stalk, 'he succumbed, helpless' (*niśceṣṭaḥ samapadyata*; 12.273.17) from her continued oppression. Brahma intervenes on Indra's behalf, and, at the request of an appeased Brahmahatyā, finds a new host for her, distributing Brahmahatyā – the brahmanicide – across four elements. One quarter is assigned to Agni, who will dispel it from himself by transmitting it to the man who fails to kindle Agni ('Fire'), the oblation-carrier. Another quarter is assigned to the nymph-like Apsarās, and they in turn will be able to dispel it from themselves by transmitting it to the man who has intercourse with a woman during her menstrual period. In addition, one quarter is assigned to flora – trees, herbs, grasses – and one quarter to the waters: the former transmitting it to the man who cuts those flora during Parva days and the latter to the man who spits, urinates or defecates into the waters. When Indra is thus freed from Brahmahatyā, he at that point, in Book

Twelve, determined to offer the Aśvamedha.

Given the recurring structural elements that characterize the myth of the traumatized warrior and his recovery, it is significant both that the Apsarās figure centrally en route to Indra's recovery and that half of Brahmahatyā should be portioned out equally between Fire and the Apsarās. Regarding the former point, Dhand's observations in her study of female sexuality in the Epic are pertinent:[86]

> . . . in the *Mahābhārata*, as in most classical Hindu literature, their [i.e. the *apsarās*'] roles are attenuated to that of providing sexual service to men; they are often understood as heavenly prostitutes or seductresses, who lure ascetics away from their disciplined focus or meditation into sexual engagements. Alternatively, *apsarās* represent the apex of the heavenly delights promised to heroic men. Warriors are encouraged to envision themselves consorting with *apsarās* in heaven after valiant deaths in battle. *Apsarās* are thus crucially identified by the sexual service they provide; hence where Indra's sin is displaced into *apsarās*, the association is richly suggestive. *Apsarās* are the recipients of sinfulness precisely because they, of all female creatures, embody sexuality, its attractions and its dangers.

For Dhand, the later variant of the *Udyogaparvan*, in which women as a general class substitute for the Apsarās of the *Śāntiparvan*, transfers the notion of overt sexuality and its consequences to the feminine broadly.[87]

The sexually charged feminine, and fire equally, play crucial roles in the recovery of the post-traumatic warrior in this poetic weaving of Indic Epic tradition, consistent with other expressions of the Indo-European tradition. The gaze of Brahmahatyā, whose very being is consequent to Indra's slaying of Vṛtra – the Vedic heroic deed *par excellence* – a 'horrible gaze' (*ghoranetrā*)[88] fixed on the unsuspecting Indra Vṛtrahan – leads to her joining herself to him and the robbing him of his *ojas* 'vigor, power' (Indo-European *$h_2$éug-os; cf. Latin *augustus* 'venerable, majestic', *augēre* 'to increase, strengthen'[89]) and leaves the great warrior *niśceṣṭaḥ* 'helpless, powerless'. But there is a means of recovery, and it is bound up with the sexually charged feminine (the Apsarās, or women generally from a perspective in which the notion of eroticism is innate to woman) and Fire.

8.5 The Debilitating Gaze

The gaze is debilitating. In Indo-Iranian tradition, its destructiveness is

made plain.

8.5.1 The Indic Warrior and His Stand-In

Nahuṣa – who is *ghoradṛṣṭi* 'having a horrible gaze', who is the substitute Indra, the local stand-in for the remote traumatized warrior, a threat to the society whose protection is the warrior's proper function – this Nahuṣa does not avert that horrible gaze from Śacī, unlike the case of CúChulainn and Hercules/Semo Sancus and the erotic potentialities that come within their own fields of vision, and not doing so, Nahuṣa brings about his own destruction. There is danger in the gaze for Nahuṣa himself. The woman can gaze at the warrior (the stand-in for the warrior in the Epic case of Nahuṣa) without incurring harm, but the warrior cannot gaze at the woman without incurring harm. In the Epic perspective, it is the un-averted gaze that results in restoration of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior Indra. The stand-in for the dysfunctional warrior in the Indic reflex of this Indo-European mythic tradition undoubtedly suffers the fate that in primitive Indo-European conceptualization the warrior-in-crisis would suffer were he not to turn his gaze away from the on-looking sexually charged feminine.

8.5.2 The Nart Warrior

The destructiveness of the feminine gaze acted out in Indic Epic is seconded in Nart tradition: here, the feminine gaze brings destruction to the warrior (rather than to a warrior stand-in), rendering him vulnerable to weapons – though the erotic element is notably mooted. The Abrahamic-faith context of the Caucasus in which Nart Epic has evolved is perhaps at work here; compare Colarusso's observation that in the tradition of "The Marriage of Nart Warzamas," in which Satanaya[90] (Ossetic Satana) is abducted, "her treatment at the hands of her abductor is never spelled out, the bards seemingly having become sensitive regarding the sexual implications of this abduction."[91]

The motif of the nude feminine is, however, preserved in the person of this prominent Nart figure, as seen, for example, in the Circassian tradition that relates how the Nart herdsman Zartyzh watched Setenaya,[92] a proverbial Circassian beauty, as she bathed by a stream.[93] An ejaculant of sperm speeds from the herdsman across the water toward Setenaya, striking a stone on the ground beside her. Colarusso remarks:[94] "Variants have Setenaya washing clothes, dishes, or her own body by the bank of a river. In all cases her conduct is unwittingly revealing."[95] In the opening lines of the tradition as

reported by Colarusso, Setenaya is referred to as the "temptress," a Circassian term that Colarusso translates more literally in the notes as "bitch witch" and about which he observes:[96]

> It is not clear what the older significance of this epithet might have been, but currently this seems to have a pejorative tone. After the early conversion of the Circassians to Christianity and later to Islam, Setenaya seems to have persisted in folklore by undergoing a moral bifurcation into a temptress sorceress, on one hand, and a fertile wise mother, on the other.

The rock that was hit by the herdsman's sperm was impregnated. Setenaya kept the stone in a warm place for "nine months and nine days" as it grew; she then took it to the smith Tlepsh, who split it open: a flaming baby boy toppled out, burning a hole through the front of Setenaya's dress as he fell to the floor. Tlepsh picked up the infant with his tongs and cooled him by plunging him repeatedly – seven times – in water: such was the birth of the warrior Sawseruquo, Ossetic Soslan (". . . le héros favori, le plus actuel aussi des légendes nartes, autant chez les Tcherkesses et les Abkhaz qu'en Ossétie."[97]). In a variant of the tradition, Setenaya, rather than the stone, was impregnated, and after a feverish gestation gave birth to the flaming infant: "The fiery hero, thus conceived, is quenched and tempered like steel . . . ."[98] We again find ourselves in familiar territory: an (Iranian) Ossetic tradition of the birth of flaming Batraz, if not itself the source of this Northwest Caucasian tradition, must share with it a common Iranian origin[99] – one not far removed from the metaphorical expressions of the Armenian tradition of the "birth" of Vahagn (too of Iranian heritage). Note that in the variant in which Setenaya gives birth to the flaming Sawseruquo we have a linkage of woman and fire that is matched in explicitness and inextricability, among the traditions we have been examining, only by Agni's taking on of a female form (doubling Upaśruti/Śacī) in his search for Indra in *Mahābhārata* 5.

A massive exhibition of female nudity such as that which confronts CúChulainn, causing him to avert his gaze, and the exhibition of which Hercules/Semo Sancus is forewarned that he must visually avoid – with its implicit reciprocal gazing of the erotically charged women upon the figure of the warrior – and the aforementioned inherited danger of the gaze for the warrior are, in spite of more recent cultural sensitivities, all elements that reverberate in the Nart tales. In the highly productive cross-linguistic, cross-cultural Epic tradition of the Caucasus, the Indo-European mythic structure survives

in featural components distributed across the accounts of the father and son warriors: Ossetic Xæmyts and his fiery scion Batraz, and their Northwest Caucasian avatars. Thus, in West Circassian tradition, the longing gazes of the wives of the Narts fall upon Khimish (Ossetic Xæmyts) – father of Pataraz (Ossetic Batraz) – and it is this feminine gaze that will lead to his destruction, as the Narts – worried that Khimish will prove a hazard to marital fidelity – a danger to individual expressions of societal wellbeing – seek the counsel of a clairvoyant woman, a "fortune-teller,"[100] who reveals to them the means by which the hero can be eliminated. In the East Circassian tradition in which the Nart hero Bataraz, crazed by vengeful blood-lust, has turned his warrior prowess against Nart society, a clairvoyant woman directs the Narts to form their women into line and expose them to the attacking Bataraz; those women plead with him in order to rob him verbally – rather than visually – of his raging destructiveness. This is, *mutatis mutandis*, the strategy by which the dysfunctional Celtic and Italic warriors – CúChulainn and Hercules/ Semo Sancus – are robbed of their burning rage: the massive feminine presence remains, but with no indication of an exhibition of nudity or eroticism in the reported Circassian account.

But in the absence of the element of explicit feminine nudity, just as in India, the gaze remains a destructive feature. In Indic Epic it is Nahuṣa, the stand-in for the dysfunctional hero, who gazes upon – and is gazed upon by – the *femme fatale* Śacī. In Nart Epic it is the heroic warrior himself who suffers the fate of Nahuṣa. West Circassian Pataraz, the maniac avenger of his father's homicide, meets his own end when his clairvoyant foster mother is tricked into gazing upon him at the moment he is struck by arrows, by which gaze he is rendered vulnerable to the assailing shafts.

This same feature, along with other particular elements of the Indo-European tradition, finds expression no less in the dossier of the father. Thus – much as the post-traumatic Indra flees to a remote space where he takes refuge in a lotus within a watery locale, to be found by his wife (and "subsequently" by Fire [Agni] in the form of a woman) when she becomes miniature and enters the lotus led by the spirit of divination Upaśruti – so the Ossetic hero Xæmyts, wandering in remote space, finds and weds a diminutive frog-like maiden, a submarine genie, who will later flee back to her watery home after implanting within her husband's back the embryo of their child – to be delivered in a fiery birth nine months later by the sorceress Satana. In West Circassian tradition, Khimish (Ossetic Xæmyts) is killed, consequent to the lustful gaze of the Nart wives, when a clairvoyant woman reveals to the Nart warriors the vulnerability of Khimish: the

Narts contrive a plan by which the mother of Khimish gazes on him just as an arrow is shot at him; the feminine gaze is his undoing. We are surely here not far removed from Brahmahatyā of the horrible gaze who robs the Vṛtrahan, Indra, of his power, the warrior caught unawares as he makes his way through space, sending him into helpless retreat in a remote watery space within the stalk of a lotus.

8.6 Fire and the Feminine: The Recovery of the Warrior

One of the findings that has emerged in the preceding investigation of the role of the feminine erotic in the Indo-European tradition of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior is the close association of fire with the *recovery of the warrior*, a fire that is in each case linked with the feminine presence. In keeping with other inversions we have observed, there is variation in the valency of the action of fire in the several traditions; that is, one can view fire as participating in two types of valency relationships. The action of fire may be essentially monovalent – fire itself seeks out, draws out, the traumatized warrior. The fire may be part of a divalent relationship – that is, fire is drawn out from within the traumatized warrior in conjunction with *feminine agency*. Fire seeks out, draws out the warrior; and fire is drawn out of the warrior.

8.6.1 Fire and Monovalency

The action of fire in Indic Epic is monovalent, and fire is made equivalent to the feminine. In *Mahābhārata* Book Five, the search conducted by Śacī – erotically desired Śacī – for the hidden Indra is doubled by the search conducted by Agni (Fire) in the marvelous form of a woman: as we have seen, the two are (at some compositional moment) set as consecutive events by the Epic poets. In the narrative of the *Mahābhārata*, each event is crucial to Indra's return to society: Śacī's discovery of the warrior god sets in motion the plan that will result in the downfall of Nahuṣa; and Agni's discovery of the warrior will bring the hymning delegation of gods and seers to Indra, who, praised by Bṛhaspati, will grow again to full size and regain *balam* ('power').

Any view of strict monovalency in the Indic tradition of the dysfunctional warrior is, however, compromised by the intricate weavings of Epic tradition. In the episode of Indra's slaying of the divine Brahman Viśvarupa/Triśiras – that brahmanicide which, concatenated with the slaying of Vṛtra, drove Indra to retreat from society (see §8.4.1.2.2) – the Epic poets relate how Indra, after he had

struck down his three-headed opponent with his thunderbolt, gazed upon Viśvarupa lying dead; whereupon, the poets tell, Indra was *dīpitas tasya tejasā* 'set aflame by the *tejas* of that one' (*Mahābhārata* 5.9.26; on the notion of *tejas* and Nahuṣa's power to rob others of it with has gaze, see §§8.4.1.1; 8.4.4.2.1). Indra recruits a woodcutter to remove each of the three heads of Viśvarupa; with his foe so decapitated, thrice, Indra becomes *vijvaras* 'free from fever' (5.9.43).[101]

8.6.2 Fire and Feminine Agency

In the Celtic and Italic traditions, on the other hand, fire is in a divalent relationship with the feminine. The warrior's dysfunctional condition is itself characterized as a fiery turmoil that must be extinguished in order for the warrior to recover, and the recovery is effected in conjunction with the agency of an erotic feminine presence.

8.6.2.1 The Irish Warrior.

The *ferg* of CúChulainn, directed against the Ulaid, his own folk, is quenched by his immersion in three successive vats of cold water after he succumbs in the presence of the women of Emain Macha, who exhibit themselves to him lewdly. In his own study of the warrior, Dumézil drew attention to this fieriness of young CúChulainn's *ferg*, making the comparison to the flaming birth of Batraz:[102]

> . . . the "flame of fire" which possesses and physically devours Batraz, which will provide his force in combat and give him the appearance of an incandescent mass (no less singular than the various "*delba*," especially the "form" of the purple ball, which CúChulainn assumes); the bodily "conflagration," to which the corresponding moral condition is a permanent state of frenetic furor: all this, for Batraz, is congenital.

CúChulainn's *delba* to which Dumézil here refers are the terrible 'forms' that the hero would assume whenever possessed by battle rage.[103] These warrior contortions had already presented themselves when the young CúChulainn first left his mother and home for Emain Macha and was there attacked by 150 boys with whom he wished to play ball. Discussing the hero's epic fights with the warriors of Connacht, Rees summarizes this *ríastrad* of CúChulainn:[104]

> His body trembles from head to foot like a reed in a cross-current.

> He puts his body into such convulsions that his heels, calves, and thighs seem to be in front, his feet and knees behind. He draws one of his eyes far into his head, the other spurts out onto his cheek, and his mouth is so contorted that the whole head of a man could easily fit into it. Sparks of blazing fire are seen in the clouds above his head, his hair bristles wildly, like the red hawthorne, the light of the champion beams forth from his forehead like a whetstone, and from the crown of his head ascends a thick column of black blood that is like the mast of a great ship.

What is important to note in this regard is that CúChulainn's warrior madness – finding physical expression in these grotesque transformations – is not a one-time occurrence. It is a recurring phenomenon throughout his warrior career, and when he is possessed by such madness, he is a danger to both friend and foe (*Táin Bó Cúailnge* lines 1651, 1655–1657):

> *Ar bá bés dó-som in tan no linged a lón láith ind, ... Ní aithgnéad cóemu ná cairdiu. Cumma no slaided ríam 7 íarma. Is de sin doratsat Fir Ól nÉcmacht in ríastartha do anmaim do C[h]oin C[h]ulaind.*
>
> For it was customary for him when his champion's blaze [or warrior's frenzy[105]] sprang up, ... He would know neither dear ones nor friends. He would strike in front and behind alike. From that the men of Connacht gave CúChulainn the name the *Riastartha*.

The incident of warrior rage, *ferg*, that possesses CúChulainn following his slaying of the three sons of Nechta Scéne in a remote space, and his violent return to the society of the Ulaid, is but one instantiation of this psychological state – that one to which the Irish bards gave expression within the structure of the inherited Indo-European mythic tradition of the dysfunctional warrior, characterized by those several constituent elements that we have been exploring herein. Ritual and mythic expressions of the robbing of the primitive Indo-European warrior of his battle rage need not, perhaps, have always entailed the mechanisms displayed in this tradition; but these mechanisms unmistakably populate the recurring expressions of the mythic tradition of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior and his restoration to society. And in the Irish expression of this tradition, fire is present – present as a furor within the warrior that is drawn out by immersion within cooling waters, in conjunction with the averted gaze before a multitude of nude women.

8.6.2.2 The Italic Warrior.

In a parallel fashion, in the Italic myth of the enraged warrior, a tale of Semo Sancus recast as Hercules, the traumatized dragon slayer, in the grip of *ira* ('frenetic rage'), forces his way into the sacred grove of Bona Dea and there finds relief from the *aestus*, the 'consuming heat; fury; mental suffering', that possesses him in the cooling waters of the goddess' stream. Ingesting those waters, Hercules' fiery rage is quenched – there in the presence of the nude devotees of Bona Dea, women who in their worship of the goddess are reputed to exhibit exquisitely lewd behavior. Juvenal makes the popular notion unmistakably clear in his sixth satire, in which he characterizes the rites of Bona Dea "as an opportunity for sexual dissipations."[106] Consider lines 314–334:

Nota Bonae secreta Deae, cum tibia lumbos
incitat et cornu pariter vinoque feruntur
attonitae crinemque rotant ululantque Priapi
maenades. O quantus tunc illis mentibus ardor
concubitus, quae vox saltante libidine, quantus
ille meri Veneris per crura madentia torrens!
Lenonum ancillas posita Saufeia corona
provocat et tollit pendentis praemia coxae,
ipsa Medullinae fluctum crisantis adorat:
palma inter dominas, virtus natalibus aequa.
Nil ibi per ludum simulabitur, omnia fient
Ad verum, quibus incendi iam frigidus aevo
Laomedontiades et Nestoris hirnea possit.

Tunc prurigo morae inpatiens, tum femina simplex,
ac pariter toto repetitus clamor ab antro
"iam fas est, admitte viros." Dormitat adulter,
illa iubet sumpto iuvenem properare cucullo;
si nihil est, servis incurritur; abstuleris spem
servorum, veniet conductus aquarius; hic si
quaeritur et desunt homines, mora nulla per ipsam
quo minus inposito clunem summittat asello.

Bona Dea's secret rites are well enough known – when the flute
stirs up the loins, and carried away by horn and wine alike,
Priapus' raving maenads whirl their manes and shriek.
How much fire then burns in their minds for some sex,
what a voice comes on with the wanton dance, how great
that sheer Venus stream across their dampened thighs!
Saufeia – ungarlanded – challenges the brothel-keepers'

slave girls and takes the buttock-jutting prize,
and she herself reveres Medullina's coital undulations.
The ladies share the prize – their skills the equal to their birth.
Nothing there will be pretend; it's all going to be
the real thing – could light a fire in Laomedon's son,
long-time cold, and in herniated Nestor.
Then libido won't tolerate delay – then it's the feminine pure
and simple – and from all alike a shout's repeated from the grotto:
"The time has come – bring in the men!" Her paramour's asleep? –
she commands the young man to put on his cap and hurry to her;
if that won't work, she jumps on the slaves; if there's no hope
of slaves, a water-carrier will be hired to come along; and if
he can't be found and humans are lacking, it doesn't take a moment
for her to offer up her ass to a donkey positioned at the ready.

Typified as so many frantic *Priapi maenades* 'maenads of Priapus' (the god with an oversized phallus), Bona Dea's erotic devotees themselves have a fire that rages within.

8.6.2.3 The Armenian Warrior.

Fire is there at the recovery – the "birth" or "rebirth" – of Vahagn in the Armenian song recorded by Moses of Chorene. Much as in Indic Epic, Fire (Agni) in the form of woman – as well as woman herself (Upaśruti/Śacī) – seeks out Indra Vṛtrahan, shrunk to a tiny size, hidden in the stalk of a lotus, so in the Armenian song, smoke – and then fire – rise from the stalk of the sea reed, grasped by birth pangs, and from the reed leaps the diminutive Vahagn, Vṛtra-slayer by etymological pedigree, with fiery hair and moustaches and burning eyes. Here the two elements are wed together indissolubly, that of fire and feminine fecundity, the latter an expression of the eventive state of the erotically charged female – and only eventively distinct from the expression of the erotically charged feminine of Juvenal's sixth satire – she who burns with a fire for intercourse. Fire and the feminine element are again one, as in the *Udyogaparvan*, and as, even more so, in the account of the *Śāntiparvan*, where Śacī substitutes for Agni in leading the gods and seers to Indra, hidden in his watery place of retreat. In this Armenian "birth" narrative, of Iranian origin, fire may be seen to be effectively ambivalent – on the one hand playing an active role in the recovery of the dragon slayer – to the extent that its presence characterizes the encapsulating reed in the throes of birth

ew i boc‘oyn vazēr xarteaš patanekik.
And out of the flame leapt a small red-headed young man.

– but also emanating from the recovered warrior himself – though appearing less to be “drawn out” in Moses’ brief and succinct hymnic record than to be a natural attribute of the warrior –

na howr her ownēr,
boc‘ ownēr mōrows,
ew ač‘kownk‘n ēin aregakownk‘.
He had fire hair,
he had flame moustaches,
and his little eyes were suns.

– with no suggestion of the warrior’s being necessarily robbed of a pathology that endangers or otherwise compromises the security of the society that is his responsibility to protect. As noted earlier, Moses goes on to make passing reference to songs rehearsing the dragon-slaying and Herculean exploits of the Armenianized Iranian hero.

8.6.2.4 The Nart Warrior.

Fire is equally present at the birth of the Nart Batraz. This is undeniably a birth narrative; in its attested Ossetic form, the “recovery” of the hero is made his entry into the world: the fieriness of the neophyte warrior is bound up with the performance of no combat deed upon which follows the onset of trauma. As Dumézil observed in his study of the Nart warrior, the fiery ardor of Batraz is “congenital” rather than being an acquired condition – rather than being a product of warrior rage – *ferg*, in the case of CúChulainn.[107] Here, the conjunction of fire and the sexually charged female is made through the phenomenon of “birthing” much as in the case of Armenian Vahagn. But there is more in this case, as we have seen: in the Ossetic account, Satana, the temptress, delivers Batraz from an abscess on the back of his father, Xæmyts, and then goes in search of the additional water required for extinguishing the flames of Batraz, trading sex with a dragon, or the devil, for the cooling liquid. This is Batraz’s beginning; the heroic deeds of the Nart warrior will follow. But that Batraz has a part in the Indo-European tradition of the traumatized warrior is clear from various elements detailed earlier, including the unbridled warrior rage that he will unleash upon his own society – upon the Narts.

8.7 Roman Ritual – and Myth

Fire seeks out the warrior-in-crisis. This is fundamental to the Indic reflex of the Indo-European myth of the dysfunctional warrior, and this Fire, Agni, is inextricably linked to the feminine – the feminine presence that is sexually charged and vital for the recovery of the warrior-in-crisis. Both of these elements recur in Roman tradition, unequivocally attested in the ritual complex of the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae.

8.7.1 The Poplifugia/Nonae Caprotinae

The motif of feminine eroticism is pronounced in the aetiological account of the Roman ritual of July 7, the Nonae Caprotinae, the allo-ritual that celebrates *resolution* of warrior-crisis. If we straightforwardly disambiguate the Nonae Caprotinae from the Poplifugia, as seems most natural and consistent with the calendrical evidence (see §2.2.4), the *onset* of warrior-crisis is commemorated by the allo-ritual of July 5, the Poplifugia ('people flee'), typically rehearsing the disappearance of Romulus, but also commemorating the incursion of hostile military might. A crisis in the realm of the military specialist – oppression at the hands of a foreign power – finds resolution when Tutula and the Roman slave-women who follow her go out of the city into the enemy camp and rob the threatening force of its warrior prowess with a massive and incessant application of feminine eroticism. Though the rituals of July 5/7 couple two distinct expressions of crisis in the warrior realm, reflected in the trauma of the *populus Romanus* (the panic of the *populus* at the loss of Romulus in a remote space and the oppression of the *populus* by warrior power localized in a remote space[108]), Roman ritual event closely parallels, *mutatis mutandis*, the lewd conquest of the raging CúChulainn by Mugain/Scannlach and her followers, who go out to meet the warrior who has traveled into remote space; the women do so in order to resolve the threat to the people of Emain Macha posed by the debilitating trauma of the warrior – CúChulainn's maniacal furor.

8.7.1.1 Nonae Caprotinae.

The pronounced eroticism of the Roman account is rehearsed and celebrated in the rites of July 7 as slave-women process out of the city (and in the Roman account the women behaving lewdly are "appropriately" recast as slave-women): the brilliantly dressed women engage in sexual banter and teasing with the men whom they meet, reminiscent of Mugain's exhibitionistic enunciation addressed to CúChulainn, and even engage in mock combat, ostensibly a ritual expression of Tutula and her follower's role in the fight with the Latins (Plutarch *Cam.* 33.6), but again evocative of Mugain's declaration to

CúChulainn that a woman's breasts would be the warriors he would have to engage.

More than this, as pointed out earlier (see §1.4), the entirety of the Nonae Caprotinae is saturated with expressions of fecundity – the wild fig, milk,[109] goats. Free and slave-women alike sacrifice to Juno Caprotina beneath a wild fig tree, a *caprificus* (the 'goat fig'), and use the milk-like sap of the fig tree to do so (Varro, *Ling*. 6.18; Macrobius *Sat*. 1.11.36, 40); they make use of a branch from the fig tree in their rites (Varro again); they feast shaded by branches from the goat fig (Plutarch *Cam*. 33.6; *Rom*. 29.6). The rites take place in the vicinity of the Caprae Palus 'Goat's Marsh' (Plutarch *Romulus* 27.6). Feminine eroticism cannot be separated from its eventive state (presumably some number of births would be expected to follow from the slave-women's erotic conquest of the threatening warrior host) – no more here than in the case of Vahagn or Batraz.

Though possibly implicit in the sex talk in which slave-women engage the men whom they meet on the Nonae Caprotinae, what is conspicuously absent from the Roman ritual complex is mention of the gaze – the averting of the warrior gaze from the erotic feminine and the visual fixing of the warrior within the sight of the erotic feminine. We saw it to occur in the Italic myth of the traumatized hero Hercules/Semo Sancus within the distant locale of the Aventine grove of Bona Dea: it is thus not a feature of the Indo-European tradition that is unknown in Rome. One finds, moreover, yet another distinct mythic expression of this element in Roman tradition, as we shall soon see (§8.7.2.1).

8.7.1.2 The Fugalia.

Mention should be made of Augustine's comments on a ritual that he names the *Fugalia*, as he challenges that it be demonstrated if the pagan gods had any care *de vita et moribus civitatum atque populorum a quibus colebantur* 'concerning the life and right traditions of the cities and *populi* by whom they were worshipped' and, if so, at what gatherings such things were openly proclaimed (*De civ. D.* 2.6):

> *. . . non ubi ludi agerentur obscenis vocibus et motibus histrionum, nec ubi Fugalia celebrarentur effusa omni licentia turpitudinum (et vere Fugalia, sed pudoris et honestatis)*.
>
> . . . not where *ludi* were staged with actors' obscene enunciations and movements, and not where the Fugalia were celebrated unrestrained in every open expression of indecency (and "Fugalia" truly – but [a fleeing] of decency and moral rightness).

Early in the nineteenth century, Niebuhr equated the Fugalia with the Regifugium in his highly influential work on Roman history,[110] and others appear to have followed his lead; but Merkel was certainly right, three decades later, in pointing out, contra Niebuhr, that by the name *Fugalia* Augustine must be making reference to the Popli *fugia*.[111] The 'Flight of the Populus' is itself, no less than the Nonae Caprotinae, associated in antiquity with notions of sexuality and fecundity.

8.7.2 Horatius and Horatia

In several detailed studies,[112] Dumézil called attention to the combat between Roman Horatius (the third, that is, sole surviving member, of the three brothers Horatii) and the three brothers Curiatii of Alba Longa (cousins of the Horatii) under the auspices of Rome's third king, Tullus Hostilius, in Rome's war-by-proxy fought against that city. The French scholar convincingly argues that the annalistic tradition of Rome is cognate with the Indic account of the slaying of the three-headed Viśvarupa/Triśiras by Trita Āptya (the third Āptya brother; see §8.4.1.2.2), under the auspices of Indra, and of the Irish account of the killing of the three sons of Nechta Scéne by CúChulainn (see §7.3). The second and third of these traditions (Indic and Celtic) have already figured conspicuously in our analysis of the post-traumatic dysfunctional Indo-European warrior. The tradition of the raging warrior Horatius is no less significant for this investigation.

8.7.2.1 Horatia's Gaze and Horatius's Ferox.

Building on Dumézil's beginnings, Allen (2003) significantly expanded the analysis of the Indra-Tullus comparison – in work to which reference was made in §8.4.4.3. Allen compares, among other elements, the figures of Brahmahatyā, the personified feminine expression of brahmanicide, and Horatia, the sister of Horatius. One of the shared characteristics to which he points is *gaze*:[113] we have already drawn attention to Brahmahatyā being of horrible gaze (*ghoranetrā*); in comparison, Allen points to Horatia's intense stare at Horatius, in the account of the Greek historian of Rome, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, as Horatius returns to the city after having slain the three Curiatii, one of whom was the lover of his sister Horatia. Allen observes:[114]

> Brahmahatyā is dishevelled, her gaze dreadful (*prakīrṇamūrdhajā caiva ghoranetrā ca*, 273.11). Livy only says that Horatia lets down her hair (*solvit crines*) and tearfully calls on her dead lover. In the Greek, hearing what has happened, she abandons all decorum. Rushing out of the house (where an unmarried young lady ought to be engaged in domestic work), she runs to the city gates 'like the maenads', and abuses her brother, staring at him intensely . . . .

Horatia shares with Juvenal's devotees of Bona Dea the characterization of *maenad-like* (see §8.6.2.2.). Running beyond the walls of the city, writes Dionysius, Horatia wails and beats her breasts in mourning for her slain beloved and (*Ant. Rom.* 3.21.5) –

> ἀνακλαυσαμένη δὲ τὸν μόρον τοῦ μνηστῆρος ἀτενέσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἰς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὁρᾷ . . .
> after bewailing the fate of her lover, she gazes on her brother with fixed eyes . . .

With Dionysius's phrase ἀτενέσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς 'with fixed eyes', compare, for example, Luke 4.20, written of Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth: καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ 'and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on him'; immediately following, those who gazed so intently ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ 'were all filled with rage' and drove Jesus toward a precipice, intending to push him over the edge (4.28–29). Similarly, *inter alia*, Lucian *Fugitivi* 10, where a personified Philosophy speaks of Sophists being unable to hold their gaze upon her (οὔτε ἡμᾶς ἀτενέσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καθορᾶν δυνάμενον). And with the wording of *Antiquitates Romanae* 3.21.5,

compare also the expression ἀτενίζω τοῖς ὄμμασιν, meaning 'to gaze at intently with the eyes', i.e., 'to stare', as in Hippocrates *Epidemiae* 7.10. With the verb ἀτενίζω used independently to mean 'to gaze upon', consider the passive participle of *Anthologia Graeca* 16.204, on an image of Eros by the sculptor Praxiteles:

> . . . . φίλτρα δὲ τίκτω
> οὐκέτι τοξεύων, ἀλλ' ἀτενιζόμενος.
> . . . . and I give birth to erotic passion
> no longer by shooting my arrows, but by being gazed upon.

Horatia gazes intently, and as she does so she speaks – berating and cursing her brother Horatius. Whereupon Horatius, fresh from combat, ruthlessly turns on her, accusing her of having no love for either her fatherland or her brothers, addressing her as ὦ ψευδοπάρθενε καὶ μισάδελφε καὶ ἀναξία τῶν προγόνων 'you false-virgin, brother-hater, and unworthy of our ancestors' (*Ant. Rom.* 3.21.6). His anger reaches a fever pitch (3.21.7):

> ταῦτ' εἰπὼν οὐκ ἐφύλαξεν ἐν τῷ μισοπονήρῳ τὸ μέτριον, ἀλλ' ὡς εἶχεν ὀργῆς ὠθεῖ διὰ τῶν πλευρῶν αὐτῆς τὸ ξίφος, ἀποκτείνας δὲ τὴν ἀδελφὴν παρῆν ὡς τὸν πατέρα.
>
> When he had said these words he gave up keeping his hatred of vileness in check – more than that – being possessed by a passionate anger he drove his sword through her side – and having killed her, went off to their father.

Livy, in his pared-down account of the event,[115] identifies the place of the meeting of brother and sister as outside of the Porta Capena, and denotes the possessing rage of Horatius by the Latin term *ferox* (1.26.3):

> *Movet feroci iuveni animum conploratio sororis in victoria sua tantoque gaudio publico*.
>
> The lamentations of his sister in the moment of his own victory and of the great joy of the people shook the heart in the savagely violent young warrior.

Latin *ferox*, and its comparative *ferocior*, recur throughout the episode in Livy: it is what Ogilvie refers to as "the key-word of the section,"[116] used repeatedly of Tullus Hostilius, of the two sets of triplets who

fight for Rome and for Alba Longa, and, as here, of Horatius, the victor of the combat.

Ferox is a derivative of *ferus*, 'wild, savage, ruthless' – the term that is used to characterize Mars in the archaic hymn of the Fratres Arvales (CIL I² 2), the priests of Dea Dia who, in their goddess's sacred grove situated close to the distal boundary of that great sacred space of Rome, the Ager Romanus,[117] call on the warrior god to leap to the boundary (*limen*). The hymn is preserved as follows, with all but the last line being repeated in triplicate[118] (the translation below follows that of Schilling 1991b:604):[119]

Enos Lases iuvate
Neve Luae Rue Marma sins incurrere in pleores!
Satur fu, fere Mars, limen sali sta berber!
Semunis alternei advocapit conctos!

Enos Marmor iuvato!
Triumpe, triumpe, triumpe, triumpe, triumpe!
Help us, O Lares!
Mars, O Mars, don't let Dissolution, Destruction pounce upon the people (?)!
Be satisfied, savage Mars; leap to the boundary, take your position!
You will invoke the Semones one by one, all together!
Help us, Mars, O Mars!
Victory, victory, victory, victory, victory!

Latin *ferus* is of primitive Indo-European origin, evolving from the root *ǧʰwer- 'wild beast'; cognate forms survive in, *inter alia*, Greek θήρ, denoting 'wild beast, monster', and Lithuanian *žvėrìs*, Old Russian *zvěr'* 'beast'; compare Tocharian B *śerwe* 'hunter'.[120]

In origin, Latin *ferox* – that is, *ferōx* – is a compound, descended from Indo-European *ǧʰwer-h₃ōkʷs, denoting 'beast-eyed' – that is, 'having an eye/a look like that of a wild beast'. With *fer-ōx*, compare Greek βο-ῶπις 'ox-eyed' – that is, 'having large, bovine-like eyes', used to describe the appearance of goddesses and mortal women; Κύκλ-ωψ 'round-eyed', naming the Cyclopes and used adjectivally to describe the moon, and so on.[121]

In the account of the *Antiquitates Romanae* (3.21.5–6), after Horatia fixes her gaze upon her brother Horatius (ἀτενέσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἰς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὁρᾷ), Dionysius of Halicarnassus places on her lips the question: τίνος ἔχων ψυχὴν θηρίου; 'what sort of beast's heart do you have?', employing a derivative (θηρίον) of θήρ, the Greek cognate of

Latin *ferus*, initial member of the compound formation *ferōx*. Horatius, at this moment, has returned to domestic space, but he is out of place in that setting: there is within him, possessed by rage as he is, the essence of a being that belongs to the savage world that exists beyond the boundary of ordered society. The feminine gaze – the intense stare of Horatia – directed toward the warrior who has become a menace to society is answered by *ferōx*, a state characterized by the savage gaze of the wild beast: a scenario of reciprocal gazing is lexically set up by Livy's presentation of the tradition of the raging, dysfunctional warrior and the ocular feminine. How far are we from Śacī and Nahuṣa?

8.7.2.2 Horatius and the Indo-European Dysfunctional Warrior.

There are clearly links between the Indo-European tradition of the warrior's fight with a triple enemy (here, the raging Horatius's combat with the three Curiatii), on the one hand, and, on the other, the tradition of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior as developed in the present work (here, the raging Horatius's murder of Horatia). Indeed, in the Indic, Irish, and Italic reflexes of the tradition of the traumatized hero, it is subsequent to the fight with the triple adversary that the warrior falls into dysfunctionality. There is no indication of this contingency in the Iranian traditions that have been treated in this work, the extent they are attested. Iran does, however, have its own heroic slayer of a tricephalic dragon – he is Thraētaona, corresponding to Indic Trita Āptya, slayer of the tricephalic Triśiras (a Vṛtra variant; see §8.4.1.2.2).[122]

The two Indo-European traditions (that of the warrior who slays a triple opponent and that of the dysfunctional warrior) would perhaps best be seen as overlapping mythic structures (both founded in the phenomenon of the warrior's rage) that can be concatenated at a point of commonality.[123] It is of course for this reason that Dumézil could use the accounts of Horatius's combat with the Curiatii alongside Indra's/Trita Āptya's slaying of Triśiras and CúChulainn's fight with the three sons of Nechta Scéne as a set of comparanda in his study of the warrior who faces the triple adversary, even as he drew attention to the similarities between the cooling of the *ferg* of CúChulainn in three vats of water and the tempering/extinguishing of the fiery neonatal Batraz in seven vats.[124]

Horatius is slayer of the triple adversary, but he is unmistakably the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior. Much as in the Irish account of the warrior-in-crisis, Horatius fights his triple opponent in a liminal space and then returns from that space to the city of his own society,

infected with an animal rage that will make of him a domestic danger. In each instance, Irish and Roman, the returning warrior is met by the *populus* outside of the limits of the urban space to which he returns, Emain Macha and Rome. In both traditions, the pathologically enraged warrior is confronted by the feminine element, and fixed within the feminine gaze, in this extra-urban space. But at this point, the tale of Horatius might seem to trail away from the syntagmatic structure of the Indo-European tradition as we have seen it to unfold. Let us consider each of these common Irish-Roman facets in more detail.

8.7.2.2.1 *Horatius and CúChulainn.*

CúChulainn and Conchobor's charioteer, Ibod, travel beyond the boundary of Ulster into the remote space inhabited by the triple adversary, the three sons of Nechta Scéne. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 3.18.1–2) records that the Horatii and the Curiatii meet in combat in a space that lies between the camped armies of Rome and Alba Longa (μεταίχμιον ποιησάμενοι τὸν διείργοντα τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλβανῶν ὄρον). The camps are situated on either side of the boundary that divides the territory of Rome from that of Alba Longa: the combat of Horatius and his triple adversary occurs in a remote region, relative to urban Rome, more or less at the frontier divide.

Livy is less explicit regarding space. In his rendition of events, the Roman army has made an incursion into Alban territory, drawing the Alban army out of Roman territory, in which it has been encamped. It is as the Alban army reaches the Roman in its pursuit that representatives of the two cities meet and arrange for the conflict to be decided by combat between the two sets of triplet warriors, at an arranged time and place (*tempus et locus convenit*; 1.24.3). Livy takes advantage of the narrative moment to provide an account of the description of a Roman fetial procedure for legitimating the combat. As otherwise attested, the declaration of war by the Roman priests called the Fetiales involves a Fetialis's penetrating the boundary of the enemy territory and moving through the space of that territory – subsequently casting a spear across the boundary.[125] Perhaps we should see in Livy's decision to discuss the ritual of the Fetiales in conjunction with the combat between Horatius and the three Curiatii the hint of an implicit awareness of a conspicuous tradition of that combat occurring in a liminal space – in a boundary area. This liminality is reflected in Livy's postscript to the combat in which he states that in his own day the graves of the five slain warriors could still be seen: two Horatii buried closer to Alba Longa, 'in one place' (*uno loco*), and the three Curiatii buried closer to Rome – *sed distantia*

locis, ut et pugnatum est 'but in separate locales, just as had been the fight' (1.25.14).

After defeating his own triple adversary, CúChulainn, hearing the wail of Nechta Scéne, flees in his chariot back across the Ulster border toward Emain Macha, possessed by a debilitating rage – posing a danger to the society of the Ulaid. Horatius, in contrast, returns triumphant to a hero's welcome from the Romans (*Ant. Rom*. 3.21.2); but still he will pose a danger. And, just as CúChulainn returns bearing in his chariot the severed heads of the sons of Nechta Scéne and other spoils from his three fraternal victims, so Horatius returns *trigemina spolia prae se gerens* 'exhibiting his three-brother-spoils' (Livy 1. 26.2). Similarly, Dionysius (3.20.4) records of Horatius that:

> σκυλεύσας δὲ τοὺς τῶν ἀνεψιῶν νεκροὺς εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἠπείγετο πρῶτος ἀπαγγεῖλαι θέλων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ νίκην τῷ πατρί.
>
> when he had stripped the spoils from the bodies of his cousins, he hurried to the city wanting first to tell his father of his own victory.

When the raging CúChulainn approaches Emain Macha, the clairvoyant woman Leborcham, or a watchman (see §9.3), witnesses from a distance the danger that his arrival will entail for the warriors of Ulster. The king Conchobor responds by ordering the Ulaid women to go out and meet CúChulainn naked, exhibiting themselves to him lewdly – the act that will bring about the warrior's recovery as he turns his gaze from theirs and is subdued by other warriors, his rage cooled in three vats of water. When Horatius approaches the walls of Rome, writes Dionysius (3.21.2):

> ἄλλον τε ὄχλον ὁρᾷ παντοδαπὸν ἐκχεόμενον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν προστρέχουσαν
>
> he sees a throng of all sorts of people pouring out from the city and indeed his sister running toward him

The throng (ὁ ὄχλος) of the *populus*, the variegated masses, exiting the city to greet Horatius is quite different from that nude delegation that comes out of the *dún* at Emain Macha to meet CúChulainn.[126] Horatia, however, learned about the outcome of the combat between the two sets of triplets, and so about the approach of her brother one can infer, from one who is similarly a witness of the unfolding events; Dionysius writes: ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατοπέδου τινὸς ἤκουσεν ἀπαγγέλλοντος τὰ περὶ τὴν μάχην 'she heard about what happened in the fight from some man

from the army encampment' (3.21.3). And realizing that her lover is dead, Horatia abandons social convention: she, a παρθένος ἐπίγαμος 'marriageable virgin' (but a ψευδοπάρθενος 'false-virgin' according to Horatius), takes to the streets and 'gives herself over to the throng' (εἰς ὄχλον αὑτὴν ἔδωκεν). Her behavior becomes anything but that appropriate to a παρθένος ἐπίγαμος: she is 'overpowered by an erotic desire' (ἔρωτι κρατουμένη) for one of her cousins, the Curiatii – τὸ πάθος ἀπόρρητον 'the off-limits passion' that she has kept hidden. We again encounter ἀπόρρητος 'off-limits' – a passion that is not to be known by others, though her father had given approval to a marriage to the cousin. So overpowered, she becomes ὥσπερ αἱ μαινάδες 'just like the maenads' – and in the state of such a sexually charged, frenzied devotee of Bacchus, she is swept along to the city gates and on out beyond the walls (3.21.2–4), much like the erotic figure Scannlach or Mugain, who leads the delegation of Ulster women out to meet the approaching CúChulainn.

As in the Irish tradition, the element of the erotic feminine is thus very much present in the account of the returning Horatius – as is the affiliated gaze, as we have already seen (ἀτενέσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς 'with fixed eyes'; *Ant. Rom.* 3.21.5): Horatia fixes Horatius in that gaze, and after wailing for her dead lover, castigates her brother for being a savage beast at his core – for being, like the Mars who is invoked by the Fratres Arvales and who operates at the boundary of Roman society, *ferus*. But beast-eyed Horatius, the warrior characterized by *ferox*, does not avert his own savage gaze from the feminine gaze of Horatia. And here the annalistic tradition of Rome's beginnings departs from what we have seen in most reflexes of the Indo-European tradition – in Ireland, in the Caucasus, and even in Italy (in the case of Hercules/Semo Sancus). Yet in this regard, *feroculus*[127] Horatius reminds us of Nahuṣa, who is *ghorarūpa* and *ghoradarśana* 'having a horrible appearance', *ghoradṛṣṭi* 'having a horrible gaze', and so on, who gazed upon Śacī – a terrifying gaze that proved to be his own undoing. So will Horatius's failure to turn away from his sister carry a heavy penalty. And there is no robbing Horatius of his rage – he kills – unlike CúChulainn, who possesses the potential to kill, but whose *ferg* is removed by the application of successive frigid soakings, as the Nart Batraz is similarly cooled of his neonatal fieriness. In Rome, the recovery of this dysfunctional warrior, Horatius, entails the rescue of his own life, not the lives of others; and the process by which recovery occurs, unlike anything we have encountered thus far, is juridical – one of the application of Roman law.

8.7.2.3 Horatius and Roman Social Justice.

The post-combat warrior Horatius has murdered his sister Horatia. The crime with which the king, Tullus Hostilius, charges Horatius is not, however, homicide, but *perduellio* (acting as an enemy against one's own country), a crime against the state. Horatia's actions were also deemed criminal – the crime of *proditio* 'betrayal, treachery'; but Horatius usurped the position of the state in addressing his sister's crime – delivering the punishment without trial and conviction.[128] Horatius, the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior, is a threat to society, operating without its ordered bounds. Tullus appoints *duumviri* to prosecute the case: "It is to be presumed therefore that since the powers of the *duumviri* emanated from the *populus*, the final decision always, at least in theory, rested with the people . . . ."[129]

The *populus* exerts its power over the warrior: through the agency of the *duumviri*, the *populus* convicts Horatius. He is sentenced to be executed; *lex horrendi carminis erat* 'the law was of dreadful formula" (Livy 1.26:6):

> . . . *si vincent, caput obnubito; infelici arbori reste suspendito; verberato vel intra pomerium vel extra pomerium*.
>
> . . . if [the *duumviri*] win [their case], let [the *lictor*] veil his [i.e. Horatius'] head; let him hang him by a rope on an infelicitous tree; let him scourge him either inside of the *pomerium* or outside of the *pomerium*.

It is apparently the scourging that is intended as the means of execution, rather than hanging.[130]

The option of performing the execution of Horatius either within the *pomerium* or beyond the *pomerium* is intriguing. Ogilvie writes that "the provision *vel intra pomerium vel extra pomerium* corresponds to the distinction between *imperium domi* and *imperium militiae*. The *duumviri* are empowered to hold the execution wherever is convenient"[131] (emphasis is my own). Words that Livy (1.26.11) assigns to the father of Horatius, as he argues in defense of his son, might be construed to suggest as much, when the father rhetorically calls for the scourging to be done either in the vicinity of the place where the spoils of the Curiatii have been set up – that is, within the *pomerium* – or at the place where the Curiatii fell and were buried – that is, beyond the *pomerium*:

> *Quo enim ducere hunc iuvenem potestis, ubi non sua decora eum a tanta foeditate supplicii vindicent?*
>
> For to what place can you lead this young warrior, where his own

deeds of valor will not deliver him from so great a vile punishment?

In any event, the choice of locales would not simply equate with a division of the spaces in which Horatius took the lives of his victims. Horatia was buried where she fell; as burials were customarily not permitted within the *pomerium* (see §4.4), her murder must have occurred beyond that boundary, not within it. The burial of the Curiatii would, in the annalistic tradition, perhaps be situated even beyond the larger Roman space of the *Ager Romanus*, depending upon the precise liminal locale envisioned for that combat.

That the operative principle is simply "the convenience of the lictor" makes for an uncomfortable fit in the archaic world of Roman religious casuistry.[132] The choice is between torturously terminating the life of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior within the urban sacred space or outside of that sacred space. The sacred spaces of ancient Rome are various and intersecting,[133] but given the sacred salience of that space within the *pomerium* relative to that space outside of the *pomerium*, the choice can be effectively characterized – in gross and relative terms – as being one between an execution within sacred space or within profane space: either is an acceptable arena for resolving the problem of the violently dysfunctional warrior – the warrior who has murdered and wrested from society its legitimate right of enforcement.

Let us note that at this point in the annalistic treatment of the dysfunctional Horatius – criminal Horatius – we have progressed into territory unfamiliar to the other reflexes of the Indo-European post-traumatic warrior. Indra is reintegrated into the society of the gods and returned to his position of king of gods after being sought out by Fire (Agni) and Śacī, and then by a delegation of the gods and seers led by the priestly Bṛhaspati, who hymns Indra back into action. CúChulainn is restored to the society of the Ulaid when his *ferg* is quenched by submersion in vats of cold water. Hercules/Semo Sancus, following his own cooling in the stream of the grove of Bona Dea, goes on to found the altar of the Ara Maxima, centrally associated with Roman social order, a place of oaths and agreements. And Ossetic Batraz goes on to claim his characteristic role in Nart society following his cold-water cooling/tempering at birth. Armenian Vahagn is born, or re-born, in fire for a similar career, it seems. Horatius, in contrast, is condemned to an ignominious death on an *arbor infelix*; he is condemned by the state, by *duumviri* acting as agents of the *populus*. Again, his downfall is reminiscent of that of Nahuṣa, the stand-in for the dysfunctional warrior, who, like Horatius, did not turn away from

the gaze of the erotic feminine.

But as Horatius is convicted by the *populus*, he will be spared by the *populus*. His execution is not realized. Horatius appeals his conviction, and his father passionately pleads with the *populus*, the Quirites (Livy 1.26.10), for the life of his son, invoking, as we saw earlier, Horatius's *decora*, his 'deeds of valor'; thus (1.26.12):

> *Non tulit populus nec patris lacrimas nec ipsius parem in omni periculo animum, absolveruntque admiratione magis virtutis quam iure causae.*
>
> The *populus* could bear up neither to his father's tears nor to his own heart, a match for every danger, and acquitted him, more out of admiration for his valor than by the justice of his cause.

The *populus* wields the power of life and death over the warrior.[134]

8.7.2.4 Horatius and the Power of the Erotic Feminine.

Horatius will be ritually cleansed of the murder of Horatia by the rite of the *sororium tigillum*, the sense of which Dionysius of Halicarnassus translates into Greek: καλούμενον τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ διαλέκτῳ ξύλον ἀδελφῆς 'being called in the Roman language the "sister's beam"' (*Ant. Rom.* 3.22.8–9). The slaying of Horatia provides an aetiology for the expiatory offerings associated with the ritual, sacrifices conducted from that time on by the Horatian family, writes Livy (1.26.13), and for the erection of the wooden beam that is the *sororium tigillum*. Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 3.22.6–9) records that the Pontifices set up two altars, one to Juno (ᾗ λέλογχεν ἐπισκοπεῖν ἀδελφάς 'who is allotted to watch over sisters') and the other to Janus Curiatius, on which the offerings were made, and that a wooden beam was extended above the altars with each end of the beam being fixed in opposite walls so that the beam passed over a certain street.[135]

> τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τὸ χωρίον τῆς συμφορᾶς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μνημεῖον ἐν τῇ πόλει φυλάττεται θυσίαις γεραιρόμενον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτόν, ...
>
> This space is preserved in the city as a memorial of the misfortune of the man, being honored by the Romans with sacrifices annually, ...

Horatius's head was veiled, and this young warrior, *iuvenis*, was made

to pass under the beam (Livy 1.26.13), and he was thereby, writes Festus (p. 297M), *liberatus omni noxia sceleris* 'set free from every harm of sin'.

Festus further specifies that the cult title of Juno to whom sacrifice is made on this occasion is *Sororia*[136] – Juno associated with female puberty. Festus's remarks reveal that the adjective *sororius* in the name of the beam (*sororium tigillum*) relates semantically most immediately not to *soror* 'sister' but to the sense of the derived verb *sororiare*, denoting the growing of the pubescent female breasts: *sororiare mammae dicuntur puellarum, cum primum tumescent*, ... '*sororiare* is used of the breasts of girls, when they first enlarge . . . .'[137]

8.7.2.4.1 The Sororium Tigillum and the Post-Combat Warrior.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus alerts his readers to a wider use of such a wooden beam for expiatory rites (*Ant. Rom.* 3.22.7–8):

> . . . καὶ θυσίας τινὰς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ποιήσαντες τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καθαρμοῖς ἐχρήσαντο καὶ τελευτῶντες ὑπήγαγον τὸν Ὁράτιον ὑπὸ ζυγόν. ἔστι δὲ Ῥωμαίοις νόμιμον, ὅταν πολεμίων παραδιδόντων τὰ ὅπλα γένωνται κύριοι, δύο καταπήττειν ξύλα ὀρθὰ καὶ τρίτον ἐφαρμόττειν αὐτοῖς ἄνωθεν πλάγιον, ἔπειθ' ὑπάγειν τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ὑπὸ ταῦτα καὶ διελθόντας ἀπολύειν ἐλευθέρους ἐπὶ τὰ σφέτερα. τοῦτο καλεῖται παρ' αὐτοῖς ζυγόν, ᾧ καὶ οἱ τότε καθαίροντες τὸν ἄνδρα τελευταίῳ τῶν περὶ τοὺς καθαρμοὺς νομίμων ἐχρήσαντο.
>
> . . . and when they [i.e. the Pontifices] had offered certain sacrifices on these [altars], they performed other purificatory rites, the last being a leading of Horatius under the yoke. Among the Romans it is customary, whenever they secure the weapons of surrendering enemies, to set two wooden beams upright and to fit a third across the top horizontally, then to lead their war-prisoners beneath these [beams] – and when they have passed through, to let them go free to their homeland. This thing is called by [the Romans] a "yoke," – which those purifying this man [Horatius] used at that time as the last of the customary means of purification.

While Livy makes no comment in this regard in his account of the cleansing of Horatius (1.26.13), he does call attention to such a *iugum* 'yoke' constructed similarly, but of three spears, in his report of the Roman defeat of the Aequi in 458 BC at Mons Algidus (3.28.10–11):

Cincinnatus, the Roman dictator, required the defeated warriors of the Aequi to pass through this structure before releasing them to depart, *ut exprimatur tandem confessio subactam domitamque esse gentem* 'so that finally a confession would be squeezed out of them that they were a subjugated and broken people'.

If Livy seems to view the ritual as merely a public expression of subjugation and humiliation,[138] it has long been proposed that the archaic function of this *iugum* was to rob those who passed beneath it of a noxious potentiality: Frazer characterizes the procedure in the *Golden Bough* as "a purificatory ceremony, designed to strip the foe of his malignant and hostile powers before dismissing him to his home."[139] Drawing in the yoke of Horatius, Warde Fowler writes:[140]

> Horatius was undoubtedly *sacer*, i.e. taboo, in an infectious condition, dangerous to society. But in this peculiar form of passage under an arch or *iugum*, the religious authorities were able to apply a method of disinfection, which in the language of a later age is naturally spoken of as *expiatio* or purification.

Ogilvie similarly surmises: "Those who passed through it were purified from harmful forces whether of blood-guilt or of effective hostility."[141]

This interpretation is further motivated by the annual celebration of the rite of the Sororium Tigillum on the Kalends of October, noted in the *Fasti fratrum Arvalium*.[142] Its date is surely significant to the close of the military campaigning season – the passage of the Roman warrior out of an active state of military engagement. It is one of a set of October rituals centrally concerned with the warrior, human and divine – a concatenation to which other investigators have drawn attention; thus, Dumézil writes: "En revanche, à la fin de la saison guerrière, sur les cinq *feriae statiuae* anciennes du mois d'octobre, trois sont consacrées à la rentrée des combattants."[143] The Ides of the month brings the deeply ancient rite of the Equus October, the sacrifice of a horse, the war animal, to Mars, the war deity, in the Campus Martius, the dedicated warrior space; it is a ritual that is demonstrably homologous with the Vedic horse sacrifice, the AŚvamedha – that is, the two are of common Indo-European origin.[144] On October 19 are celebrated the rites of the Armilustrium, the lustration of arms, in which the Salii, carrying the *ancilia*, play a role (Varro *Ling.* 6.22).

The month of October stands in notable opposition to March,[145] the month of Mars, which marks the beginning of the year in the archaic

ten-month calendar – and the onset of the period of military campaigns. It is in March that the *ancilia*-bearing Salii make their dancing ritual journey through Rome, singing their archaic *Carmina Saliaria*. As the transition between old year and new comes to an end, on March 14, an even-numbered and thus *inauspicious* day, there occur the Second Equirria with the ritual of the Mamuralia, the driving out of the one designated Mamurius Veturius, the 'raging/frenzied one of Mars'. As the warring season nears, the dysfunctional warrior within a domestic context – a menace to his own society – is ritually driven from the city. Driven out – one would suspect – to the extramural space which is proper to the enraged warrior, to the space where his *furor* can be turned against the enemy, in keeping with the warrior's right function. In October, in contrast, on the Kalends, an *auspicious* day, the dysfunctional warrior – the aetion Horatius – is ritually robbed of his warrior madness, as the warring season comes calendrically to an end.

What we find then in the Sororium Tigillum is a curious configuration of elements, martial and fecund. A primitive structure annually utilized to denude ritually the Roman warrior contingent of its war-making psyche is bound – in its name and in its sharing of space with another cultic apparatus – with the biological event of the development of the pubescent female breast, and hence with the onset of feminine eroticism. The *sororium tigillum* is, to rephrase the name quite literally, "the beam of the enlarging breast," of burgeoning eroticism, that steals away the warrior's madness – that robs him of the threat of a dysfunctionality that would make of him a menace to that society which it is his role to protect. The feminine erotic coupled with the reciprocal gaze that recurringly presents itself in the Indo-European myth of the dysfunctional warrior, that plays a crucial role in restoring that warrior to functionality, has been replaced in this particular Roman ritual instantiation of that tradition – the instantiation of the Sororium Tigillum of October 1 – by a procession through sacred space beneath an overshadowing (over-gazing) cult expression of feminine eroticism. An aetiology for this ritual event is provided by an appropriation of the ancestral myth of the dysfunctional warrior, synchronically embodied in Horatius, who, characterized by *ferox*, the gaze of one who ranges beyond the boundary of ordered society, does not turn away from the fixed gaze of the maenad-like Horatia, but who takes her life; one who is thereupon condemned to die by a juridical process of the Roman state – the Roman *populus* – but whose life is then spared – who is recovered – by a reprieve from the *populus*, so that he submits, in the end, to the power of the feminine erotic, via Roman cult, and now with his gaze veiled: the dysfunctional warrior is restored.

This Horatius fades into oblivion following his restoration. He is no CúChulainn who takes his place in the service of the king Conchobar – who becomes the greatest warrior among the Ulaid. He is no Indra, the Vṛtrahan, who returns to divine kingship. He is no Hercules/Semo Sancus, who establishes the Ara Maxima, a fundamental space and cult apparatus of pre-Romulaean Roman order – and an Italic hero whose subsequent warrior exploits are suggested by the Hercules equation. He is no Vahagn, who goes on, following his exodus from the fiery reed to perform his own Herculean exploits and dragon slayings. He is no Batraz, whose flaming birth and cooling signal the beginning of his Nart warrior career. Horatius is a nondescript killer – a dysfunctional hero of the moment; even the name is bleached of personality: he is Horatius who kills Horatia. His role is only to provide an aetiology – an aetiology of, ultimately, primitive Indo-European origin. He is a foil for the Sororium Tigillum – for the power of the swelling breast over the warrior.

8.7.2.4.2 Janus Curiatius and Power of the Populus.

In addition to the altar of Juno Sororia, there is of course a second altar with which the *sororium tigillum* shares cult space, that one dedicated to Janus Curiatius. Why it is that Janus should have a presence in the celebration of the Sororium Tigillum is a matter that has generated considerable speculation and consternation. Undoubtedly, as others have seen, his presence has some connection with the celebration of this rite on the Kalends – with which day both Janus and Juno are monthly associated; Macrobius writes of the goddess that *Iunonis sunt omnes Kalendae* 'all Kalends belong to Juno' (see *Sat.* 1.15.18–20) and of the god, and of the goddess, (1.9.16):[146]

> *In sacris quoque invocamus Ianum Geminum, Ianum Patrem, Ianum Iunonium, Ianum Consivium, Ianum Quirinum, Ianum Patultium et Clusivium . . . Iunonium, quasi non solum mensis Ianurarii sed mensium omnium ingressus tenentem; in ditione autem Iunonis sunt omnes Kalendae, unde et Varro libro quinto Rerum divinarum scribit Iano duodecim aras pro totidem mensibus dedicatas . . . Quirinum, quasi bellorum potentem, ab hasta quam Sabini curin vocant.*
>
> In the sacred rites we invoke him too as Janus Geminus, Janus Pater, Janus Junonius, Janus Consivius, Janus Quirinus, and Janus Patultius and Clusivius . . . [we invoke him as] *Junonius* because he possesses not only the beginning of January but the beginning of all months; all the Kalends being indeed in the power of Juno, for which reason Varro writes in the fifth book of his *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* that twelve altars are dedicated to

> Janus for the same number of months . . . and [as] *Quirinus* because he is the master of wars, after the spear – which the Sabines call *curis*.

Ovid (*Fasti* 2.475–512) likewise rehearses this folk-etymological connection of the divine name *Quirinus* with a Sabine word for 'spear' *curis* – or with the name of the Sabine city of *Cures* (see §7.4.1) – incorporating into the equation the term *Quirites*, and doing so in conjunction with his aetiological musings on the Poplifugia.[147]

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 2.48.2–4), citing Varro, draws together the three terms *Quirinus*, *curis*,[148] and *Cures* into an etymological web and anchors the envisioned linguistic relationships in the character of the founder of that Sabine city of Cures and of his own parentage. Some long ago time – the time of the Ἀβοριγῖνες 'Aborigines' (compare §1.2) – a certain young woman of Reate was dancing in a local sanctuary of Quirinus (whom Dionysius here equates with the Greek war god Enyalius) when, suddenly possessed by a divine frenzy (ἔνθεος ἄφνω γίνεται), she ceased dancing and ran into the shrine of the god. When she emerged she had been impregnated with a child by Quirinus: the young woman gave birth to a son who would be named Modius Fabidius ("Nous ignorons tout des exploits de Modius Fabidius et c'est regrettable"[149]). When the son had reached adulthood, writes Dionysius, his form (μορφή) was god-like, rather than being that of a man, καὶ τὰ πολέμια πάντων γίνεται λαμπρότατος 'and he was most famed above all for his war exploits'. This warrior *par excellence*, Modius Fabidius, conceived by a young woman in an altered, frenzied psychological state, son of *Quirinus*, goes on to found the Sabine city of *Cures*, naming the town after either his divine father or after the Sabine word meaning 'spears' *cures*.

In his discussion of the disappearance of Romulus and the subsequent celebration of the rites of the Poplifugia and the Nonae Capratinae (see §2.3), Plutarch (*Rom.* 29.1–2) similarly makes recourse to the popular etymological linkage of *Quirinus*, *Quirites*, and *cures*, and goes on to mention Juno's cult title *Quiritis* – asserting that she is so called because her statuary depicts her as leaning on a spear (*curis*). In the same way, in one of his responses to *Quaestiones Romanae* 87 –

> Διὰ τί τῶν γαμουμένων αἰχμῇ δορατίου τὴν κόμην διακρίνουσιν;
>
> Why do they part the hair of women getting married with the point of a little spear?

– Plutarch again offers this same etymological connection between Juno *Quiritis* and *curis* 'spear'.

The Greek spelling of Juno's cult title, Κυρῖτις, is ambiguous, potentially representing either Latin *Quiritis* or *Curitis*; compare the spelling Κυρῖνος for *Quirinus* in the same etymological treatments. The Latin spelling employed as the default thus far, *Quiritis*, is well attested: see, for example, *CIL* 1.396 and *CIL* 11.3125. On the other hand, one also finds the spelling *Cu(r)ritis* – as in, *inter alia*, Servius *Aeneid* 1.17.[150] Juno Curitis is celebrated at a festival on the Nones of October (October 7): the *Fasti fratrum Arvalium* preserves the entry *Iunoni Curriti in Campo* for the date. We thus find beside Janus *Curiatius*, playing a role in the Sororium Tigillum of the **Kalends** of October, a Juno *Quiritis/Cur(r)itis* who is worshipped on the **Nones** of October. These two expressions of Janus and Juno share cult titles of at least superficial phonological similarity, though Latin *Curiatius* (as in Janus Curiatius) has not played a role in the etymological wordplay preserved by Ovid, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Plutarch that we just rehearsed.

Festus (p. 49M) too makes an etymological grouping of *curis*, *Quirinus*, and *Quirites*. He adds that Juno is called *Curitis* (rather than *Quiritis* [but cf. p. 254M regarding Qui<ritis Juno>]), invoking the spear affiliation. But Festus broadens the discussion of *curis* by drawing Latin *curia* into the picture, to which we now turn.

While *Curatius* is otherwise known as an Italian name,[151] and the Curiatii (the *gens Curiatia*) are assigned a patristic presence in Rome following the razing of Alba Longa under Tullus Hostilius (Livy 1.30.2; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 3.29.7),[152] the name, *Cūriātii*, is seductively similar to Latin *cūria* (and its various derivatives, such as *cūriō* 'priest of a *cūria*'; *cūriālis* and *cūriātus* 'of a *cūria*'; *excūriāre* 'to expel from the senate'). *Cūria* is the term denoting each of the thirty population units of ancient Rome (said to be a Romulaean creation; *Ant. Rom.* 2.7.1–4), as well as the locale of the meeting of such a unit (Varro *Ling.* 5.155); for a broader Italian perspective, compare Volscian *covehriu* (ablative singular), occurring in a *lex sacra* from Velletri, a term likely denoting 'some kind of state institution with sacral duties'.[153]

The similarity between *cūria* and *Cūriātius* (as in Janus Curiatius) has been noted, and a derivative linguistic relationship often assumed. Rose proposed that the entire tale of Horatius slaying both the *Curiatii* and his sister, *soror*, was constructed from the cult titles of the two deities to whom the altars beneath the *tigillum* were dedicated, Janus *Curiatius* and Juno *Sororia*; certain others have invoked similar ideas.[154] Dumézil ably corrected that view to the extent that he

demonstrated that the slaying of the triple adversary is an inherited Indo-European mythic motif – a now widely recognized contribution to the debate.[155]

Still, the morphophonological closeness of *cūria* and *Cūriātius* remains, and an attempt to dismiss a derivative relationship – a linguistic relationship – seems suspicious and burdened by improbability. Underlying *cūria* is the fundamental notion of 'commonality, a collection of the *populus*': etymologically the term most probably has its origin in Pre-Latin **co-vir-ija*, from *vir* 'man', denoting 'an assemblage of men' (see §5.3.1).[156] The presence of a representative of such a social collective notion in the rites of the Sororium Tigillum is natural enough given its aetiology: not only did the dysfunctional warrior Horatius murder his sister, but in doing so he committed a violation against all of society, committing *perduellio*, a crime against the state, the totality of *curiae* – a crime against the *populus* at large. Thus – that sacrifices should be made on an altar dedicated to a deity styled as *Curiatius* (affiliation with the violated *populus*) – is completely in keeping – again, given the aetiology of the rites – with sacrifices made to a deity styled *Sororia* (affiliation with the violated feminine erotic).

It is abundantly clear that the *populus* has been drawn into the episode of the dysfunctional warrior as it is integrated into the annalistic narrative of the third king of Rome – a portion of the narrative that Dumézil characterized as a mythic history of Rome. Not only does Horatius commit a violation against the *populus*, but he is then convicted by the *populus* for that violation – only to be subsequently acquitted by the *populus*. All of these interactions center around the dysfunctional warrior's pathological rage directed against the erotic feminine. *Populus* and erotic feminine are inextricably linked.

8.7.2.5 Horatius and the Poplifugia/Nonae Caprotinae.

What is equally clear is that the core elements that we encounter in the annalistic tradition of the dysfunctional warrior Horatius closely recapitulate the foci of the ritual complex of July 5 and July 7 – the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae. In the case of both festival days, the *populus* is central – moving through time and space, out of Rome and across the *pomerium*, in accomplishing the rites, just as in the Horatian narrative preserved by Livy and Dionysius, the Roman *populus* plays a central role – even depicted as exiting the city *en masse* consequent to the actions of the warrior Horatius, passing out to some point beyond the boundary of the *pomerium*. What is more, the

popular exodus of the Horatian narrative is one that includes the prominent presence of the erotic feminine, à la the Nonae Caprotinae. The Horatian flight of the masses recapitulates the ambulations of the rites of July 5 and July 7 and, *mutatis mutandis*,[157] of their associated aetiologies – flights of chaos, desperation, passion.

8.7.2.5.1 Quirinus and the Poplifugia.

Conspicuous in the light of the parallelism offered by the narrative of the dysfunctional warrior Horatius is the presence of the god Quirinus in the aetiology of the Poplifugia. Romulus, the warrior who has disappeared while beyond the boundary of ordered Roman society – beyond the sacred boundary of the *pomerium* – has been assimilated into – and so existentially subsumed beneath – the divine personage of Quirinus: in annalistic tradition the god is clearly understood to be preexisting – the god who had fathered Modius Fabidius, founder of the Sabine city of Cures, which city would in some future day go to war against Romulus. As Latin *cūria* is to be derived from a Pre-Latin **co-vir-ija*, just so, for the etymological antecedent of Latin *Quirīnus* we should look to an ancestral **co-vir-ijo-*: "*Quirinus* is the god of the *Quirites*, citizens gathered together in a *curia*," wrote Benveniste, drawing together three terms of common origin.[158] There is a certain element of power – or control – or correction – that the collection of the masses wields over the warrior-in-crisis. Even as the *populus Romanus* panics and takes flight at the moment of Romulus's disappearance, the warrior-in-crisis experiences an apotheosis and is incorporated into Quirinus, the godhead of the masses, of the Quirites; in the same way, the crazed warrior Horatius, when he unleashes his *furor* on Horatia, the erotic feminine, is sanctioned, convicted, and sentenced by the *populus* – and then restored by the *populus*. In terms of Indo-European social ideology, as a societal disorder threatens that is borne from that realm that is sanctioned to wield physical force and protect society, that element associated with Mars in the divine scheme (*la deuxième fonction*), order is restored by the controlling intervention of the societal element of the masses, that great part of society that finds divine expression in Quirinus (*la troisième fonction*).

8.7.2.5.2 The Erotic Feminine and the Nonae Caprotinae.

The element of the erotic feminine, of which the maenad-like Horatia is an expression in annalistic tradition, lies at the core of the *Nonae Caprotinae* and pervades the rites and aetiology of that ritual occasion, as we have repeatedly witnessed. In the aetiology of the festival, slave-women deliver Rome from military crisis by overwhelming an

invading horde of warriors with sex. In the ritual celebration of these "goat Nones," slave-women ambulate and engage in sex talk with the men whom they meet, arresting them by their beards; and these erotic figures themselves take up arms, as it were, staging "cat-fights." Women make sacrifices to Juno Caprotina – rites bound up with elements of wild fig and goat – symbols of sexual proclivity and productivity. Fecund notions find further expression on this day as *sacerdotes publici* offer sacrifices to the grain-god Consus upon an altar that is curiously hidden beneath the earth within the great Roman space (the Circus Maximus) dedicated to the racing of chariots – military vehicles. It is no less a day of celebrating the ancient pastoral deity, Pales, whose rites and prayers preserve so well the primitive Indo-European ideology of threes.

The ritual complex of July 5 and July 7 is one in which the element of physical power and the element of fecundity and sensuality are continually intertwined. It is a celebration of deliverance from warrior-crisis – a celebration of the restoration of warrior functionality. That deliverance, that restoration of the specialist in military might, is accomplished by the intervention of those whose role is not typically to protect society but to nourish and perpetuate it. It is a celebration of the power of *la troisième fonction* over *la deuxième fonction*. Sensuality and its consequent fecundity are the arms of the "third estate."

8.8 Some Conclusions

Central to Indo-European myths and rituals treating the societal problem of the post-combat traumatized warrior are overt or perceived expressions of feminine sexual aggressiveness, including erotic displays of the female body, coupled with the gaze of the erotic feminine. There is danger for the post-traumatic warrior in the body and gaze of the erotically charged female. The sexually potent and fecund feminine has power over the post-combat dysfunctional, or even the potentially dysfunctional, warrior – the power in myth and ritual to facilitate the restoration of the warrior to a state of functionality. The ritual restoration of the warrior, specialist in the realm of physical force, such as that enacted in the rite of the Sororium Tigillum on the Kalends of October, restoration mediated by the realm of fertility, provides for a re-entry of the warrior into society – a rebirth, as it were. The metaphor of (re)birth is prominent in Iranian avatars of the myth of the traumatized warrior as captured in Armenian song and preserved in the Nart traditions of the Caucuses, where fiery Batraz is born in a state of trauma. The linkage of the condition and agency of fire and feminine eroticism is prominent in

the various Indo-European traditions attested: a duality that may find its common linkage in the several cultures in the human psyche, in a primeval cognitive coupling of fire and acts of human fertility from conception to birth. Yet one wonders if this may be the result of the weaving together of once separate strands of tradition.

More broadly, the power that the "realm of fertility" holds over the warrior is that of the "third estate," Dumézil's *troisième fonction*; Benveniste's *classe des cultivateurs*, constituting the masses of society in primitive Indo-European ideology. Such restorative power constitutes an element of societal or ideological balance, providing the masses with a certain leverage contra the physical dominance of the practitioners of force. The social tension inherent in such reciprocal power relationships finds expression in Roman aetiological tradition: in the Quirites' wielding the power of death and life over the violence-crazed Horatius; and in Quirinus, third-function deity of the Pre-Capitoline triad, into whom the warrior-king Romulus is assimilated – Romulus, the son of Mars, second-function member of the same archaic triad.

[1] Or Férach, according to textual variants.

[2] See Thurneysen 1912:538.

[3] Compare with CúChulainn's experience in the face of a troop of exposed women, that experience of another ancient Indo-European warrior, the Greek hero Bellerophon. Plutarch preserves the tradition (*Moralia* [*De mulierum virtutibus*] 248A–B). Bellerophon provided protection to the Lycians by attacking and slaying the pirate Chimarrhus, who was harassing the coast, and by driving out the Amazons. But in return, the Lycian king Iobates 'was very unjust' (ἦν ἀδικώτατος) to the rescuing warrior: Bellerophon thus waded out into the sea and prayed to Poseidon to make the land of Lycia barren, whereupon a tsunami flooded the Lycian plain. To no avail, the male population begged Bellerophon to stop the flooding. Next it was the turn of the Lycian women:

αἱ γυναῖκες ἀνασυράμεναι τοὺς χιτωνίσκους ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ· πάλιν οὖν

ὑπ᾽ αἰσχύνης ἀναχωροῦντος ὀπίσω καὶ τὸ κῦμα λέγεται συνυποχωρῆσαι.

The women hitched up their frocks and went out to face him; out of shame, then, he withdrew and the wave, it's said, retreated with him.

The aqueous context of Bellerophon's withdrawal is particularly noteworthy in light of the feature APPLICATION OF WATERS in the tradition of the post-traumatic warrior.

[4] See Dumézil 1970:135–137, who cites Boas 1897:437–446 and Frazer 1910:3:521–526. Dumézil calls attention to the description of "the celebrated monstrous 'forms' (*delba*), which Cúchulainn, for the first time, assumes or submits to" that appears in the *Book of Leinster* following the telling of the hero's cooling in vats of cold water. CúChulainn's *ferg* has, however, at this point been alleviated, and there is no cause for the bodily distortions that accompany the engendering of that rage. On the *delba*, see §8.6.2.1, where it is noted that these contortions had already been expressed at an earlier moment in the young warrior's combat career; this would not be the initiatory occasion of their appearance. Moreover, as O'Rahilly (1967:292) points out, this description of the *delba* looks to have been secondarily inserted into the text:

There is no description of the boy here in Rec. I, but it occurs in Rec. III. The passage seems to have been introduced here in LL [i.e. the *Book of Leinster*] (and Rec. III) from a later passage describing Cú Chulainn, 2344ff, which is common to all recensions. It is noteworthy that Rec. III follows the later passage even more closely than LL, . . . describing his clothes in words identical with those of the later passage . . . .

Le Roux (1966:370) rightly saw that it is not a matter of initiation, calling into comparison an incident in the Ulster Cycle tale of 'Bricriu's Feast': "On ne peut pas, en effet, parler d'initiation dans le cas de l'épisode entièrement semblable du *Fled Brecrend*." On Bricriu's Feast, see later.

[5] For the text, see Watson 1941:46.

[6] The stone perhaps strikes her rectum; the sense is uncertain: see the relevant glossary entry in Watson 1941. Ford (1998:181n16) conjectures that the specified point of impact may be the genitalia of Riches, "if the woman is facing Lóeg." Perhaps what is key is that Lóeg is *not* facing Riches – that he is *not* in her line of sight.

[7] On παριτέ as a verbal adjective, see Bulloch 1985:201. On the episode of the blinding of Tiresias in this hymn, see Depew 1994.

[8] See Westermann 1843:183.

[9] See Calame 2009:208–209, with references to earlier work.

[10] Eliot quotes Day's lines in a note in the manuscript of *The Wasteland*:

> When of the sudden, listening, you shall hear
> A noise of horns and hunting, which shall bring
> Actaeon to Diana in the spring,
> Where all shall see her naked skin . . . .

On Day's lines and the surfacing of the Greek motif of the goddess-seen-naked in *The Wasteland*, see Perret 1974.

[11] On the contributions of Magna Graecia to the tale of Hercules and Cacus, see Woodard 2006:192–193, 216.

[12] Cicero is contrasting the fate and behavior of Claudius with that of Publius Clodius, who in December of 62 BC, disguised as a woman, inserted himself into the rites of Bona Dea for the intended purpose of meeting his lover Pompeia, wife of Caesar; see also Cicero *Epistulae ad*

Atticum 1.13.3; Plutarch *Life of Caesar* 9.3–10.7; *Life of Cicero* 28. Cicero judges Clodius to have been punished for the transgression of his eyes with a 'blindness of the mind' (*caecitas mentis*). Livy (9.29.9–11) relates the tradition that the censor Appius Claudius was eventually struck blind as a consequence of having transferred the cult of Hercules at the Ara Maxima from private to public oversight.

[13] In the *Fled Bricrenn* ('Bricriu's Feast'), an Irish tale of the trickster Bricriu among the Ulaid, elements of the episode of CúChulainn's confrontation with the nude women of Emain Macha are appropriated and parodied. Bricriu invites the warriors of Ulster to attend a feast at his new home, but they are unwilling because of his reputation for mischief-making. In order to persuade them to accept the invitation, Bricriu causes the two breasts of each of the women of the Ulaid to beat against one another. Subsequently, as CúChulainn and two other champions of Ulster drive in their chariots toward the home of king Ailill and his queen Medb in the province of Connacht, where they will be judged, and the recipient of the "hero's portion" at the feast thus determined, their approach is "perceived" by Medb – which is obvious because of the tumultuous shaking that is caused by the speed and commotion of the warriors' chariot entourage – and the warriors' identities recognized when Medb's daughter Finnabair spies the Ulster warriors from the heights of the *dún* and describes their appearance to her mother (on the clairvoyance of Leborcham who perceives the enraged CúChulainn's approach to Emain Macha, see §9.3). Medb fears for the safety of those within the *dún*. To appease sexually – not to restrain physically – the three warriors, Medb sends out fifty women to each of the warriors (along with three vats of cold water) and provides them with bedrooms.

[14] On Nahuṣa and the textual traditions of his rise and fall, see especially Hiltebeitel 1977, with reference to earlier work. See also Hopkins 1969:25–26.

[15] Dumézil 1970:76.

[16] Monier-Williams 1979:454.

[17] Hiltebeitel 1977:334n21.

[18] Such is the translation of Garbutt (2008:77), which seems, given the English idiom *to play around*, to be intended to capture the sense of 'sexual play'; van Buitenen (1978:207) renders it as being 'at play'.

[19] See Monier-Williams 1979:321.

[20] On the offering of an Aśvamedha to cleanse Indra of his sin prior to Śaci's discovery of him (*Mahābhārata* 5.13.10–20), compare the account of *Mahābhārata* 12, where the horse sacrifice is offered after Śaci has sought out Indra and brought him to the gods following the demise of Nahuṣa. Hiltebeitel (1977:333) notes: "As Holtzmann [1878:309–310] has observed, this Aśvamedha changes nothing in the plot; in the *Śānti* [*Mahābhārata* 12], the Aśvamedha is prescribed by Viṣṇu *after* the fall of Nahuṣa, and is directly connected with Indra's return to his throne (12.329.39–41)." See note 27.

[21] Dumézil 1970:125.

[22] Hiltebeitel 1977:331.

[23] Dumézil 1970:125n23.

[24] Holtzmann 1878:309–310.

[25] See Hiltebeitel 1977:333–334.

[26] Here, Hiltebeitel adds a footnote (note 20): "Cf. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 7.28: the gods temporarily exclude Indra from Soma for a skien [sic] of sins headed by slaying Viśvarūpa and Vṛtra." In the preceding note, he draws attention to *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* 2.234: "Indra, helped by Agni, 'as a serpent got rid of its skin, . . . got rid of all his evil.'"

[27] Hiltebeitel (unlike Holtzmann and Dumézil) would see in the account of *Mahābhārata* 5 two different Indra-quests led by Agni, the first occurring in conjunction with the offering of the Aśvamedha (see note 20), the second being that of the search ordered by Bṛhaspati subsequent to the discovery of Indra by Śaci and Upaśruti, as described earlier (hence, three discovery episodes in total). There are difficulties with his interpretation, however. When the gods go to Indra to offer the Aśvamedha in order to free him from the guilt of brahmanicide (on which see the discussion in the text immediately following this note), there is no suggestion of a searching out of a hidden Indra; the event unfolds in this way (*Mahābhārata* 5.13.7–22): Immediately after Nahuṣa agrees to give Śaci some period of time in which to discover Indra's fate, before submitting herself to him, she goes to the gods to tell them of this arrangement, whereupon the gods pondered, 'with Agni in the lead', or, as van Buitenen (1978:210) translates this possessive compound adjective, 'headed by Fire' *cintayām āsur ekagrāḥ Śakrarthaṃ* 'pondered the cause of Śakra [i.e. Indra] intently' – where Agni occupies his typical initial (or else final) position in the enumeration of the gods (an apparent Indo-European configuration: ". . . it seems that the Indo-Europeans had already located their divinity of the beneficent fire at one or the other end positions of the sacrifice" [Dumézil 1996:323, which see for discussion]). The gods then meet with Viṣṇu and inquire of him how Indra might be released from brahmanicide; Viṣṇu replies that Indra will be purified and restored when he has offered the Aśvamedha to Viṣṇu. The gods, accompanied by teachers and seers, are then depicted as simply making their way together to a known locale (*deśa*) – to the place *yatra Śakro bhayodvignas* 'where Śakra was incapacitated with fear' – where the Aśvamedha is offered. There is no scouring of remote spaces for Indra – not by Agni – not by anyone else – and there is no indication that Agni otherwise directs the movement of the gods to that place. Again – as noted earlier – in the arrangement of *Mahābhārata* 12 the offering of the Aśvamedha is slotted into the recovery episode as Indra, the warrior-in-crisis beyond the boundary, is just about to be restored to his position of efficacy within the domain of society – that is, after Śaci (rather then an Agni in feminine form) has sought out Indra for a second time and led him to the gods –

and this follows Nahuṣa's downfall.

[28] See the discussions in Woodard 2006:194–195, 220–223, 240.

[29] For discussion, see Bloomfield 1893; Dumézil 1970:29–32; 1995:1:279–280.

[30] Dumézil 1970:38–39.

[31] Dumézil here references Feer 1886.

[32] Holtzmann 1878:310.

[33] Dumézil 1970:125n23.

[34] One member of a prototypical Indo-European triad: Aramazd (sovereignty); Vahagn (power); Anahit (fecundity); see, *inter alia*, Thomson 1976:lxiii; cf. Russell 2004:360. For general discussion with references, see Charachidzé 1991b:319–320. On Vahagn, see also Dumézil 1970:122–123, 127–133; Russell 2004:357–370.

[35] Russell 2004:357; 363. On the meter of the poem, West (2009:51) writes: "The poem on the birth of Vahagn begins with four seven-syllable lines; then, after two of nine syllables, there are two more of seven and two more of nine. Other fragments show hepta- and octosyllables, and sequences of 7 | 6 and 6 | 9 verses [citing Gray 1926:160f., 164–167]. We must reckon with the possibility that these metres developed under the Iranian influence to which Armenian culture had long been subject. But they may equally represent a native tradition."

[36] Charachidzé 1991:320.

[37] On Vərəθraγna, see, *inter alia*, Benveniste and Renou 1934; Dumézil 1970 *passim*; Boyce 1996:62–65; Thieme 1960:312–314.

[38] See Benveniste and Renou 1934:82.

[39] Russell (2004:363 [with n12]) identifies *karmrik* 'red', *vazēr* 'leapt', *xarteaš* 'red-headed', *patanekik* 'small young man'. See also Schmitt 1981:18.

[40] "Probably a kind of lute": Russell 2004:361.

[41] On the comparison to Heracles, see Thomson 1980:123nn4–5. On Vahagn as dragon slayer, see Thomson 1976:347, 349, with affiliated notes.

[42] Dumézil 1938: characterized by Roman Jacobson (1999:27) as an attentive investigation. The work finds a later expression in Dumézil 1970:128–133.

[43] Dumézil 1970:129.

[44] See Loraux 1995:32–34.

[45] Loraux 1995:33.

[46] She cites Hippocrates *Aphorisms* 5.35, translating as "a woman is

either troubled by hysteria or suffering from the pains of childbirth." See also her comments (p. 34) drawn from Hippocrates *On the Diseases of Girls*.

[47] Loraux 1995:33–34.

[48] See, for example, the collection of case studies and vignettes in Rhode 1987.

[49] See Charachidzé 1991a:317, who further characterizes the Ossetic Epic cycle in this way: ". . . it has preserved entire sections of an otherwise lost mythology . . . . it encompasses many figures that give us a glimpse into the heritage of the distant Indo-European past that may still be identified by the historian, although it is largely unknown to the lay reader."

[50] See Dumézil 1930b:50–74; 1970:137–138; 1978:21–49, 84–90 (in the latter page range, Dumézil draws attention to the 1969 work of Joël Grisward and argues for a correspondence between Batraz and Celtic Arthur; an extensive treatment seeking to link Nart tradition with Arthurian now can be found in Littleton and Malcor 2000); 1995:1:570–575. Dumézil takes the Song of Vahagn to preserve a narrative of the actual birth of the Armenian god, and hence envisions an analogical relationship of this sort: the recovery of Indra is to the birth of Vahagn as the cooling of CúChulainn is to the birth of Batraz (1970:138). In an unrelated treatment, West (2009:429) notes that the Nart and Irish heroes share a similar exploit:

In an Abaza narrative Bataraz (the Ossetic Batradz) goes out at the age of two, chases and captures a deer with his bare hands, and comes back with it under his arm (Colarusso (2002), 307) . . . . A substantial section of the *Táin* is devoted to Cú Chulainn's boyhood feats; at the age of seven he drove a herd of deer into a bog, and then ran from his chariot and caught one of them.

The episode from the *Táin* to which West refers occurs during the very flight of CúChulainn and Ibod out of the hinterlands, following his slaying of the three sons of Nechta Scéne and back to Emain Macha that I discussed earlier; it was actually the chariot team that was driven into a bog, so that CúChulainn could debark and chase down a deer. West also mentions the similarity of the Irish and Nart cooling narratives in conjunction with the birth of the "Nart hero Sosruquo" (p. 456) in Circassian, Abaza, and Ubykh (citing Colarusso 2002:53, 186, 388).

[51] For Dumézil (1970:137) Herodotus's Scythian Ares is "in the last analysis, an heir of Indo-Iranian *Indra."

[52] Charachidzé 1991a:318. See also Dumézil 1978:29–31; for a variant account of the death of Batraz, see pp. 30–31.

[53] Or traditions: "La naissance de Batraz est merveilleuse. Les variantes, très diverses dans leur début, s'unifient sur la fin, qui est l'essentiel" (Dumézil 1995:1:571). On the variants, see Dumézil 1978:214–215. On the birth of Pataraz in the Circassian Nart tradition, see Colarusso 2002:143–152.

[54] See Dumézil 1965:173–177; 1970:137–138; 1978:22–24, 214–217; 1995:1:571; Charachidzé 1991a:317; Tuite 1998.

[55] On Syrdon, see Dumézil 1986:131–229.

[56] Dumézil 1978:23.

[57] Or, in a variant, into the sea.

[58] Dumézil 1970:137–138; Dumézil (p. 138) translates: “Faster, faster! Fetch me water! I feel a flame of fire in me, an inextinguishable conflagration which devours me . . . .”

[59] His affiliation with lightning is made quite explicit (as noted earlier). After taking up residence in heaven, Batraz periodically descends to earth like lightning; for example (Charachidzé 1991a:318):

Leaping to the rescue of the Narts when they were threatened by the evil giant Mukara, he sank into the ground up to his groin. The “thunder of his cry” was enough to rout the giant. In hot pursuit, Batraz’s steel body heated up and he had to dive into the sea, smoking.

[60] See Dumézil 1978:24–34.

[61] See Loraux 1995:25–58.

[62] “The Nart epic is as richly represented among the Circassians and the Abkhazians as it is among the Ossets; it can be seen as the final result of an ancient collaboration among these cultures, a sort of reciprocal contamination. But its Ossetic, even Indo-European, origin is beyond doubt” (Charachidzé 1991a:317). See also, *inter alia*, Dumézil 1978:34–49 and *passim*; Colarusso 2002:7, 47.

[63] For a Kabardian (East Circassian) account of what follows in this paragraph, see Dumézil 1978:35–36; for a Bzhedukh (Adyghey [West Circassian]) account, see Colarusso 2002:139–143.

[64] “Sous le nom de *Peterez* (*Beterez* chez les plus orientaux), les Tcherkesses [= Circassians] ont certes emprunté Batraz, ...” (Dumézil 1978:34). For the non-Ossetic Nart traditions I follow the

transcription devices of Colarusso 2002.

[65] The Northwest Caucasian tradition of the birth narrative of Pataraz/Bataraz is variegated: “Les variantes sont nombreuses, moins altérées chez les Kabardes que dans les tribus occidentales, et elles mêlent souvent les récits de la naissance du héros et de la mort de son père” (Dumézil 1978:35).

[66] “Ils confièrent l’orphelin à une vieille femme un peu sorcière qui s’attacha à ce pupille beau et intelligent” (Dumézil 1978:36).

[67] See Dumézil 1978:35–36 for the Kabardian account. On the Ossetic tradition of the murder of Xæmyts, see Dumézil 1978:27–28: “Le meurtre de Xæmyc est rarement détaillé et les allusions qui y sont faites divergent considérablement” (p. 27).

[68] Dumézil 1978:37.

[69] Colarusso 2002:142.

[70] See Dumézil 1978:37.

[71] On the Ossetic tradition of Batraz’s avenging of the murder of his father, Xæmyts, see Dumézil 1978:28–29. It is the wise Satana who counsels Batraz in the stratagem by which he shall gain victory over his father’s killer – the Nart Sajnæg Ældar.

[72] For this litany, see Dumézil 1978:38; Colarusso 2002:149.

[73] Dumézil 1978:38: “En général, après une vive correction, Beterez renonce à pousser plus loin sa vengeance.”

[74] Dumézil 1978:39.

[75] Dumézil 1978:39: “[S]on âme ne le quittera que quand un projectile et mon regard le toucheront à la fois.”

[76] Reported in Colarusso 2002:139–143.

[77] Colarusso 1989:3.

[78] This is not to say that there is no display of male sexual aggressiveness in other cognate traditions that we have examined thus far; clearly there is: for example, the Latin (or other) warriors that threaten Rome demand the surrender of Roman women and then allot the proffered slave-women among themselves. It is to say that there is a variation in the erotic polarity of the feminine between the Iranian (Ossetic) and Indic accounts.

[79] Hiltebeitel 1977:334n21.

[80] The priest Bṛhaspati goes beyond the remote boundary to coax (successfully) Indra out of his watery space; the priestess of Bona Dea stands at the boundary of the remote space to prevent (unsuccessfully) Hercules from entering the watery locale. In both traditions, however, the traumatized hero emerges from the waters restored and ready to take his proper place again within society.

[81] Hiltebeitel 1977:334.

[82] For additional details and other epic references, see the discussion of the episode in Hiltebeitel 1977:335–337.

[83] For an exposition of the common structure of the two rites, see Dumézil 1996:221–227.

[84] Or Brahmavadhyā, as at, for example, *Mahābhārata* 1.149.6.

[85] Allen 2003:155. In this work, Allen develops a comparison between Brahmahatyā and Roman Horatia, relative to the equation of Indra and Tullus Hostilius; see §8.7.2.1.

[86] Dhand 2008:132.

[87] Dhand 2008:132: "In the second telling, it is women themselves who are characterized as being sinful. Their sexuality is the *source* of their sinfulness, but the sin does not stop there. In this case, it permeates their whole being so all of womanhood is infected."

[88] Allen (2003:155) draws attention to the gaze of Roman Horatia, in comparing her with Brahmahatyā: "Rushing out of the house (where an unmarried young lady ought to be engaged in domestic work), she runs to the city gates 'like the maenads', and abuses her brother, staring at him intensely (*atenési toîs ophthalmoîs*)." The response of her brother, the young warrior Horatius, will be to slay his sister Horatia. See §8.7.2 for discussion of Horatius as a Roman reflex of the Indo-European dysfunctional warrior.

[89] See the discussion in Dumézil 1969:79–102; see also, *inter alia*, Ernout and Meillet 1959:56–58.

[90] “West Circassian ‘Setenaya’ /sat‘anáaya/, Kabardian East Circassian ‘Seteney’ /satanáy/, Abaza and Ubykh ‘Satanaya’ /satanáya/, and Abkhaz ‘Satanay’ /satanáy/” (Colarusso 2002:31).

[91] Colarusso 1989:8. On Satana, see also Dumézil 1995:1:550–568.

[92] On the form of the name, see note 90.

[93] See Colarusso 2002:52–54.

[94] Colarusso 2002:53.

[95] Colarusso continues: “In some accounts Setenaya accepts the shepherd’s sperm gladly, in others she is angered either by being hit herself or by being subject to an indignity even though the stone is hit . . ., and in still others she is raped outright when he swims over to her.”

[96] Colarusso 2002:54n2.

[97] Dumézil 1978:91. For Dumézil on Soslan, see 1978:91–122; 1986:161–166, and *passim*.

[98] Colarusso 2002:530: “. . . but has a vulnerable point.”

[99] Strains of the Anatolian (Hittite/Hurrian) tradition of the birth of the stone giant Ullikummi from a great rock (fathered by Kumarbi) may also echo here.

[100] Colarusso (2002:142).

[101] On the episode, see Woodard 2006:207–208.

[102] Dumézil 1970:138.

[103] See also pp. 161–164 of Dumézil 1970. On CúChulainn's *delba*, see in addition, *inter alia*, Dumézil 1973:45; 1988:146–147; Hiltebeitel 1990:45.

[104] Rees 1991:271.

[105] Geoffrey Keating: ". . . for he was certain that when his warrior frenzy [*lonn laoich*] should come upon Lughaidh, and when the rage of battle should seize him, he could not be trusted by anyone": see Comyn and Dinneen 1902–1914:2:291.

[106] Brouwer 1989:203; see Brouwer generally on Bona Dea and her cult. Brouwer observes (p. 369–370), regarding Plutarch's likening of the rites of Bona Dea to those of the Orphic mysteries (*Life of Caesar* 9.3):

It is possible that he has in mind something similar to Juvenal's ideas when the latter describes the feast as an occasion for debauchery. The Orphic mysteries, too, were alleged to involve fornication. In fact it is likely that in both cases the secret and mysterious nature of the celebrations added to this ill fame, which, as regards Bona Dea, contrasts sharply with the chastity of the goddess in the myth and the continence of the women (the absence of men is an important rule) in the cult.

The grafting of Bona Dea and her devotees into the inherited Indo-European tradition of the dysfunctional warrior may equally have contributed to, or be the consequence of, suspicions of erotic behavior at the celebration of the rites.

[107] Dumézil 1970:138; and see §8.6.2.1.

[108] And these two expressions are ritually rehearsed in a common space, the Campus Martius, in the case of the larger Poplifugium.

[109] The offering and consumption of wine appears to have been conspicuous in the celebration of the rites of Bona Dea (see the discussion of Brouwer 1989:327–336); but both Plutarch (*Quaest. Rom.* 20) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.12.25) write that in its use in the cult of the goddess, wine is called "milk"; Macrobius adds that the vessel that contains the wine is called a honey jar (*mellarium*). Brouwer draws attention to the Roman use of milk offerings in "cult practices in honour of the ancient, indigenous gods" (p. 328) and suggests that Bona Dea is a natural member of that set and "that milk, in combination with honey or not, had been the original offering proper to this goddess" (p. 329).

[110] See Niebuhr 1827:338, the English translation of the first volume of Niebuhr's *Römische Geschichte* (1812).

[111] Merkel 1841:158.

[112] Dumézil 1942, 1956, 1985.

[113] Allen's (2003:155) categorical feature is: *Female looks distraught, particularly as regards hair and gaze*.

[114] Allen 2003:155.

[115] Ogilvie (1965:106) in his comment on the episode as related by Livy writes: “If Livy took over the material ready assembled, he did much to it. It can be seen from comparison with Dionysius of Halicarnassus that his literary and psychological interests led him to adapt and reshape extensively.”

[116] Ogilvie 1965:106. He notes its occurrence in 22.2 (Tullus); 23.4 (Tullus), 10 (Tullus); 25.1 (Horatii and Curiatii), 7 (Horatius), 11 (Horatius); 27.10 (Tullus); and 31.6 (Tullus). Not included in Ogilvie’s inventory is the use of *ferox* in the passage examined here (1.26.3).

[117] On the Ager Romanus as sacred space, see Woodard 2006:253–256 and *passim*.

[118] See Scheid 1998:293–302.

[119] See Woodard 2006:224, 258, 262. See also Woodard 2011:318–321, especially regarding similarities between the hymn of the Arvals to Mars and Bṛhaspati’s hymn praising Indra as he lies hidden within the lotus stalk in his remote space of retreat.

[120] See, *inter alia*, Ernout and Meillet 1959:230; Walde-Pokorny 1930:642–643; Mallory and Adams 1997:23; Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995:390.

[121] Latin also attests *atr-ōx*, from *āter* ‘black, dark’, descended from Indo-European *āter ‘fire’; compare Avestan *ātarš* ‘fire’, Armenian *ayrem* ‘to kindle’. Ernout and Meillet (1959:54) judge the word to be: “ancien, usuel; mais appartient surtout à la langue écrite. Terme plus littéraire que populaire. Non roman.” *Atrōx* denotes that which has a dark look: the senses range from ‘terrible’ to ‘savage’ to ‘shocking’.

Perhaps we should see in *atrōx* a more recent formation than *ferōx*.

[122] On Thraētaona and his relationship to Indic tradition, see Woodard 2006:195, 222–223, with references to earlier work.

[123] In Woodard 2006 I incorporate the two into a single matrix structure (see the notes to §6.1). Most of the features that relate to the description of combat with the triple enemy are absent from Irish tradition but common to Indic and Italic; the complementary distribution is notable. See Figure 4.4 in Woodard 2006:217.

[124] See, especially, Dumézil 1970.

[125] Or, alternatively, when the boundary of the enemy territory is located at some distance from Rome, the spear is cast over the *Columna Bellica* in the Campus Martius, a symbol of the spatial juncture between Rome and the hostile territory. See Festus, p. 33M; Servius, *A*. 9.53.

[126] Though the greater exodus from Emain Macha is more heterogeneous; witness the presence of warriors who subdue the raging CúChulainn when he averts his gaze from that of the nude women.

[127] For early use of the adjective, see Turpilius fragment 107R.

[128] See Ogilvie 1965:114–115. Ogilvie writes (p. 115): “Beneath the archaically colloquial language is the vestige of a very ancient law which forbade the mourning of an enemy (Ulpian, *Dig*. 3.2.11.3 . . .) . . . .”

[129] Oglivie 1965:114; see also Watson 1979.

[130] See Ogilvie 1965:115–116: "the penalty also prescribed by the Twelve Tables."

[131] Ogilvie 1965:116.

[132] On the option *vel intra pomerium vel extra pomerium*, see Watson 1979:444. See also Rüpke 1992.

[133] See Woodard 2006:162–163.

[134] Contrast, at this point, the dysfunctional warrior Camillus (see §6.4): in the case of Horatius there is again a warrior atrocity, but the *populus* is responsible both for his conviction and for his deliverance.

[135] See also Festus p. 297M on the construction of the *sororium tigillum*. Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 3.22.8) identifies it as the street leading down from the Carinae going toward the *vicus Cuprius*. On the location of the *sororium tigillum*, see, *inter alia*, Coarelli 2007:178; Richardson 1992:400 and Ziòłkowski 1992, with discussion of earlier work.

[136] See also Scholia Bobiensia on Cicero *pro Milone* 7.

[137] See, *inter alia*, the discussion of Ogilvie (1965:117), with references to earlier work.

[138] As Frazer (1935:7.2:194) observes: ". . . apparently the ceremony was only observed with prisoners who were about to be released; had

it been a mere mark of ignominy, there seems to be no reason why it should not have been inflicted also on men who were doomed to die."

[139] See Frazer 1935:7.2:193–195. Frazer includes numerous examples of typological parallels in the pages that precede; in at least the case of the Sororium Tigillum, he analyzes the operant strategy as ridding warriors "of the dangerous ghosts of their victims"; however, in the case of the *iugum*, he initially suggests, as indicated earlier, the origin to "have been a purificatory ceremony, designed to rid the foe of some uncanny powers before dismissing him to his home" (pp. 194–195) – but then goes on to invest this rite with ghost-ridding powers as well, awkwardly characterizing the Romans as "merciful conquerors" robbing the enemy of "the angry ghosts of slaughtered Romans." For a custom similar to the Roman procedure of the *iugum* that was reported among the "Tartars" in 1246 by John de Plano Carpini, envoy of Pope Innocent IV, see Halliday 1924.

[140] Warde Fowler 1913:49/1920:71; here he makes reference to earlier work (1911:58) in which he discusses this archaic sense of *sacer*, citing Macrobius *Sat.* 3.7.3, about which passage he remarks: "The explanation that follows is of no value to us; but the fact that some Romans were puzzled by the impunity of the slayer of the *sacer homo* is one of the utmost interest."

[141] Ogilvie 1965:117. See also, *inter alia*, Warde Fowler 1913/1920. Warde Fowler (1913:50–51/1920:73–74) draws a third member into the set composed of the *sororium tigillum* and *iugum*: that *porta triumphalis* that is positioned in the Campus Martius as described by Josephus (*Bellum Judaicum* 7.5.4): "A victorious army, before entering the city, had to pass under a gateway or arch which was called by this name." Warde Fowler observes:

The army was guilty of bloodshed, like Horatius, ... Even if we cannot say that the returning host was *sacer*, we know that it needed *lustratio*, and that it underwent this process immediately before passing through the *porta*: which was exactly what happened to Horatius, according to the story.

On the *porta triumphalis*, and scholarly efforts to forge an identity for it, see Beard 2009:96–100, with references.

142 In his comparative analysis of Tullus Hostilius and Indra, extending Dumézil's work on the pair, Allen offers the significant observation that just as this Roman instantiation of the Indo-European tradition of the warrior who slays a triple adversary serves as a ritual aetiology (for the Sororium Tigillum), so does the Indic expression of that same mythic tradition. Regarding the Indic ritual, Allen writes (2003:159):

This is clear not from the epic but from the Vedic ritual texts. The three accounts of the Sautrāmaṇī ritual in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (*ŚB* 1.6.3.1ff., 5.5.4.1ff., 12.7.1.1ff.) all open with references to the Indra-Triśiras conflict. Thus the second passage (which situates the ritual at the end of the royal inauguration) starts by listing the three sacrificial victims – a goat for the Aśvins, a ewe for Sarasvatī, a bull for Indra – and then asks why the ritual is performed. It answers by telling another variant of the myth in which, after Triśiras' death, the furious Tvaṣṭṛ, holds a soma ritual to which Indra is not invited. Forcing an entry, Indra consumes the sacred fluid immoderately and is weakened by it. He is restored by the ritual – performed by the Aśvins with help from Sarasvatī. Thus the ritual, named after Indra Sutrāman ('Good Guardian'), serves particularly for expiation or purification, as after immoderate consumption of soma by a priest (Eggeling 1963 [= 1995] Vol. I:165).

The triple sacrifice of the Sautrāmaṇī equates to the Roman sacrifice of the *suovetaurilia*, on which homology see Woodard 2006:122, 125, 140, 174, 180 (and *passim* on the Roman sacrifice).

143 Dumézil 1975:111.

144 See Dumézil 1996:224–227; 1975:145–156, 181–219.

[145] Dumézil writes (1942:114): “Or, le premier octobre ouvre lui aussi un des mois les plus militaires de l’année, qui est comme le réplique automnale du mois de mars, ...”

[146] Compare Lydus *Mens*. 4.2.

[147] For discussion, see Boyle and Woodard 2004:196–197.

[148] Κύρεις γὰρ οἱ Σαβῖνοι τὰς αἰχμὰς καλοῦσιν ‘for the Sabines call spears *cures*’.

[149] Poucet 1967:57. On Modius Fabidius, see Poucet’s discussion on pp. 53–59.

[150] On the two forms, see, *inter alia*, Boyle and Woodard 2004:282; Wissowa 1971:187–189; see also Dumézil 1996:296–297.

[151] See Schultze 1904:355.

[152] Compare with the Plebeian Tribune Gaius Curiatius mentioned by Cicero *De legibus* 3.20.

[153] Vaan 2008:157. See also, *inter alia*, Benveniste 2001[=1945]:440 and 1969:1:258 (and see n. 213), Chapter 5, note 11.; Baldi 1999:140–142. The text of the relevant Volscian inscription and its translation as presented in Baldi (1999:142) are as follows (see also, *inter alia*, Pulgram 1978:151–157 and Rix 2002:66):

> *deue : declune : statom : sepis : atahus : pis : uelestrom*
> *façia : esaristrom : se : bim : asif : uesclis : uinu : arpatitu*

sepis : toticu : couehriu : sepu : ferom : pihom : estu
ec : se : cosuties : ma : ca : tafanies : medix : sistiatiens

To the goddess Declona this is decreed. If anyone will have snatched [some foliage or firewood] for himself, even if it were [for] a sacrifice, it will be a violation. Let [the guilty one] place in arrangement an ox and coins for the jars and for the wine. If anyone (will have taken the foliage or firewood) with the approval of the public assembly, the carrying away will be without violation. Egnatus Cossutius, son of Seppius, and Marcus Tafanius, son of Gavius, magistrates, established [this].

154 Warde Fowler, for example, wrote of the two deities (1899:239): ". . . the original meaning of their cult-titles at the Tigillum remains unknown. All we can say is that the Janus of the *curiae* and the Juno of a sister may certainly have given point to a legend of which the hero was acquitted by the Comitia Curiata [see §3.2.1] for the murder of a sister." For bibliography, see Ogilvie 1965:117.

155 See Dumézil 1964:21–22; also see Dumézil 1996:75; 1995:1:278–280; 1970:3–11.

156 See, *inter alia*, Benveniste 1969:1:258.

157 There is the previously discussed matter of directionality (see §4.6) in the case of the aetiology of the Poplifugia (the *populus* flees from [rather than to] the Campus Martius); and warrior dysfunctionality arises in the midst of the exodus of the *populus* (rather than occasioning the flight) in the case of the aetiology of the Tigillum Sororium. Such shifts in geometry are now familiar from the preceding discussion of Indic reflexes of the Indo-European tradition.

158 Benveniste 2001[=1945]:440. See also Woodard 2006:21; Dumézil 1996:160–161, 259; Kretschmer 1920; also, *inter alia*, Coarelli 1983:1:192–197.

9 Clairvoyant Women

9.1 Introduction

Aside from the eroticism displayed by the Roman slave-women generally in the aetiology (and rites) of the Nonae Caprotinae, the figure of their leader, Tutula (Tutola/Tutela) or Philotis, expresses another distinct feature of the structural matrix of the Indo-European myth of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior. In the Indo-Iranian, Irish, and Italic reflexes of this myth, there is present a female figure who possesses notable sagacity and clairvoyance. In the various narratives the clairvoyant woman functions as a bridge between spaces: a remote space of action and the near space of society. In each case she has some immediate involvement with the figure of the traumatized warrior. The role she plays fundamentally facilitates or sets the stage for the recovery of that warrior, if unintentionally so in the case of the Italic reflex, that of the post-combat Semo Sancus, wed as it is to Greek traditions.

9.2 The Indo-Iranian Warrior

The matrix feature CLAIRVOYANT WOMAN is conspicuously present not only in the well-preserved account of the dysfunctional warrior in the *Mahābhārata* but also in the various forms of the Nart Epic traditions of the Caucasus, expressions by descent and borrowing of an ancestral Iranian tradition.

9.2.1 The Indic Warrior

In Indic tradition, Indra, the post-combat warrior in retreat, lies hidden within a lotus-flower stalk in a remote space beyond the boundary of society. Pressed by the lustful Nahuṣa, Indra's wife Śacī devotes herself to the goddess Night (Niśā or Rātrī). Through her devotion to Night, Śacī has an encounter with Upaśruti, a spirit of divination. The spirit has a name derived from the prefixed verb root *upa-śru-* 'to listen to'. Her name, *Upaśruti*, thus literally encodes the notion of aural attentiveness and perception: Sanskrit *upaśruti* signifies 'the oracular voice' and also 'rumor, report'.[1] More specifically, the term can denote, as glossed by Monier-Williams: "a kind of supernatural oracular voice (answering questions about future events,

and supposed to be uttered by an idol after mystic invocations, Vidhāna-pārijāta, T.), MBh.; Kād.; &c."[2]

Upaśruti will bridge the space separating the society of the gods from the absent Indra, appearing to Śacī and leading the goddess to her husband's remote place of hiding (*Mahābhārata* 5.14.1–12). As we saw in §8.4.1.2, this is a variant of the Agni discovery episode, with the two presented as sequential searches in the account of the *Udyogaparvan*. In the version of the *Śāntiparvan*, there are again two searches conducted to find Indra: as in Book Five, Upaśruti leads Śacī in the first search, but then Śacī returns on her own. Hiltebeitel expounds on the association of Śacī's worship of Night and the introduction of Upaśruti, following upon Ganguli's note that "divination was practiced by reference to the stars at night."[3] Hiltebeitel writes:[4]

> Upaśruti is invoked through the goddess Night (*devīṃ ratrīm*; *niśāṃ devīm*; 5.13.23 and 24), who is, at the time, "progressing on the Northern Course" (*pravṛttāmuttarāyaṇe*; 23). Due to Śacī's "devotion to her husband and truth," she is able to "perform divination" (*sopaśrutimathākarot*; 24), that is, bring forth Divination personified from the night sky during the period of the sun's movement to the north, beyond the Himālaya, and to receive from her husband his *niti* (5.15.2) on how to oust Nahuṣa.

With Indra's *niti* 'guidance' so received and implemented, the downfall of Nahuṣa and restoration of the dysfunctional warrior Indra are set in motion.

9.2.2 The Iranian Warrior

We have seen that in the traditions of the Nart sagas, the feminine figure Satana (Satanaya, etc.) has been described as "the embodiment of profound wisdom and intelligence, while also being a sorceress and seeress."[5] Like Roman Tutula (or Philotis, etc.), she is perceptive and knowing (see §9.5); like Upaśruti, she has penetrating skills of divination. As something of a hybrid of Upaśruti and Tutula in her presently attested Nart identity, she, like both the Indic and Roman figures, seeks out the solution:[6]

> Satanaya's "magic" is often seen as being based upon a sort of early science. Satanaya is not merely powerful and all-knowing, but she is capable of examining certain matters and divining their nature by her intelligence. This scientific skill is evident again in the myth "Lady Satanaya and the Magic Apple" (Hadaghat'la vol.

> I,3.2:86–90) wherein Satanaya has “discovered” the capacity of a gold and white apple to impart immortality and everlasting youth to any who tastes [sic] of it. She has not divined its properties by magic or some act of revelation, but rather by inquiry.

At the same time, she has a distinct clairvoyant nature, conspicuously on view, for example, in the Abaza saga recorded by Colarusso, where we read:[7]

> She was a girl among them, a female. It was she who was the Narts’ fortune-teller. And all that they did, you see, what shall be, that battle, that which shall happen among the Narts, she foretold. Turning to her first, they would tell her the essence of their own affairs. “Is our affair reasonable or not?” they would say before her. She would point them on the way, and they would stay on that path.

It is this “sorceress and seeress” Satana who, in Ossetic tradition, delivers Batraz from the abscess on the back of Xæmyts, his father – the fetal Batraz having been planted there by his mother when she abandoned her husband Xæmyts. Batraz falls flaming into seven cauldrons of water – a quantity insufficient to cool his fiery ardor. Satana is instrumental in relieving the neophyte warrior of his flaming trauma by searching out and providing more cooling liquid to rob him of that trauma, obtaining the water by engaging in sexual intercourse with an oppressive agent – like Tutula, who employs sex to deliver the Roman warrior element from a traumatized state. The clairvoyant feminine and the erotic feminine converge or are narrowly aligned.

Other clairvoyant female figures surface in the various Nart traditions of the Caucasus. In Ossetic tradition, Batraz is born already a warrior. In Circassian tradition, however, as we saw in §8.4.3.2.2, when Khimish (Ossetic Xæmyts) is abandoned by his wife and he himself is murdered, his infant son Bataraz (Ossetic Batraz) is given into the care of an old sorceress. Bataraz, the Nart reflex of the dysfunctional warrior, will be son to a clairvoyant foster mother.

Bent on avenging the murder of his father, Khimish, Bataraz will in time turn his furor against the Narts. It is a sorceress who advises the Narts concerning how to divert his warrior rage, telling them to arrange the Nart men in one row and the women and children in a second row, which will expose itself to Bataraz. Following her intervention, the eventual outcome is “une vive correction”:[8] if less directly than in the Ossetic tradition, still the enraged Circassian Nart warrior realizes societal functionality consequent to the actions of this

clairvoyant woman.

In Bzhedukh (West Circassian) tradition, in a variant account of the murder of Pataraz's father Khimish, when the Nart women turn a lustful gaze upon Khimish, their husbands consult a clairvoyant woman in order to discover a means by which he may be killed. They learn from this "fortune-teller" that if his mother gazes upon him as he is shot with an arrow, then the missile will penetrate him and he will die; and possessing this knowledge, the Narts slay Khimish. Compare with this the Bzhedukh tradition reported by Dumézil in which it is the son, Pataraz himself, that is so killed: Pataraz's enemies trick his foster mother into revealing this vulnerability, and as she gazes upon him, he is shot; and so, as fated, he dies.

In the case of these Bzhedukh traditions, the clairvoyant female does not serve to restore a dysfunctional warrior to societal functionality, but instead to rid society of a warrior figure who is perceived, by some element of society, to be a threat – a resolution of the problem of the dysfunctional warrior of another sort. The difference in orientation of the traditional elements that we see in these cases is reminiscent of the geometric rearrangements that we encountered earlier in Irish and Indic traditions of the dysfunctional warrior: variant synchronic realizations of a diachronic dimension.

The bridging of near and distant spaces that characterizes the mediations of the divining spirit Upaśruti and the clairvoyant woman of Ulster, Leborcham (see discussion immediately following in §9.3), is not so readily perceived in the case of the several Nart figures just rehearsed. There is, however, a feminine form in Nart tradition that does figure in such an arrangement, namely, the wife of Ossetic Xæmyts. This shape-shifting, frog-like daughter of the sea god Donbettyr alternates between the distant aquatic space in which Xæmyts had met her (on which space see §10.2.2) and the space of Nart society, passing from the one to the other and then back again after the conception of her heroic son Batraz – fetally implanted in his father's back, delivered by the clairvoyant Satana. This wife of Xæmyts and mother of Batraz herself shows a clairvoyant tendency to the extent that she, in effect, foretold to her husband at the time of their marriage the circumstance under which she will leave him and return to her own family – displaying foreknowledge of the incident by which she will bridge those two discrete spaces, far and near.

9.3 The Irish Warrior

The flight of the raging CúChulainn out of the distant space beyond the boundary of Ulster following his triumph over the three sons of

Nechta Scéne within that space and the danger that he poses to Emain Macha as he returns to the society of the Ulaid, still possessed by a warrior rage, is perceived at a distance by the sorceress Leborcham ("the daughter of Aí and Adarc"), the clairvoyant nurse of Deirdre, heroine of the Ulster Cycle.[9] Leborcham's knowing and formidability is a stock tradition of Irish lore; she is a poet, a *ban-chainte*, typically translated as 'woman-satirist', though English *satirist* provides a somewhat anemic rendering: an element of magic is fundamental to the role and power-laden malediction hardly less so.[10] Though physically malformed, Leborcham possesses, in addition to preternatural knowledge, great speed of movement, and so serves as Conchobor's go-between: a bridging role that is completely in keeping with the character of the Indo-European clairvoyant feminine as we have seen her develop in this work. Perceiving that a threat approaches Emain Macha, Leborcham cries out that a young warrior draws near in a chariot and that many of the Ulaid shall perish that night if he is not stopped. The king Conchobor surmises the identity of the warrior whose approach the clairvoyant Leborcham has sensed, and commands that the necessary, and seemingly obvious, measure be enacted – the sending out of the force of completely nude women to display themselves lewdly.

Much like Upaśruti, *mutatis mutandis*, Leborcham divines the presence of the dysfunctional warrior across the space that separates that warrior from his own society. In each case, their clairvoyance leads to the performance of acts that will rescue society from the consequences of the warrior's dysfunctionality and concomitantly restore the warrior to his proper function within society. In both instances, Indic and Irish, the corrective measure involves the employment of the feminine erotic, bound up with the affiliated gaze.

9.4 The Italic Warrior

After slaying Cacus, Hercules/Semo Sancus is overwhelmed by a debilitating heat, fury, anguish (*aestus*) and possessed by a frenetic rage (*ira*). His flight is from the Palatine, scene of his combat with the monster, and the earliest Roman urban space circumscribed by the *pomerium*,[11] to the trans-*pomerial* Aventine, space of the grove of Bona Dea, depicted as if it were some remote, wilderness locale. At the margins of that Aventine space, a silver-haired old woman confronts the traumatized hero Semo Sancus. Propertius (4.9.61) identifies her as an *anus*, word meaning 'hag, sorceress', used to denote the prophetic Cumaean Sibyl (*Cumaea anus*), as in Ovid's *Fasti* 4.158; in *Remedia amoris* 254, the same poet uses the term without modification for 'sorceress' generally: *Non anus infami carmine rumpet humum* 'No

sorceress will rend the ground with incantation that ought not be uttered' (compare Horace *Epod.* 5.97–98, used of the vile sorceresses Canidia et al.).

Propertius's *anus* is further described as a motherly priestess (*alma sacerdos* [4.9.51]) of Bona Dea – goddess whose devotees can be characterized as maenad-like, as erotically charged (see §8.6.2.2). The old priestess foretells the hero's fate should he enter the remote space of the grove – the fate of the blinded prophet Tiresias (see §8.3.1) – and forbids him to do so (4.9.53–54):

Parce oculis, hospes, lucoque abscede verendo;
cede agedum et tuta limina linque fuga.
Avert your eyes, stranger, and depart this holy grove,
withdraw now and leave its thresholds in safe flight.

Positioned at that threshold, the prognosticating priestess mediates between the intra-*pomerial* space of Palatine society and the distant (extra-*pomerial*) space of the lush, wooded grove of the goddess with its *avia secreti limitis unda* 'remote stream of hidden course' (4.9.60) to which the traumatized hero has fled following his combat with the cattle-thieving, tricephalic monster Cacus. Structurally and functionally she corresponds, *mutatis mutandis*, to the divining spirit Upaśruti, who mediates between the comparable spaces of Indic tradition: that of the society from which Indra Vṛtrahan has fled following his slaying of the cattle-thieving monster, with its tricephalic affiliations, and that of the water-filled remote space in which Indra has taken refuge in his traumatized state (himself overwhelmed by heat prior to – in the Epic poets' arranging of elements – the woodcutter's decapitation of his tricephalic victim [see §8.6.1]) to hide within the stalk of a lotus.

In the Italic tradition, as Propertius's elegy preserves it, the priestess is described as kindly (*alma*), but her aid to the retreating hero in returning him to functionality is in fact unintentional: to confirm the presence of the refreshing spring within and to save him from the "fate of Tiresias" – "to assure," so to speak, the averting of the hero's gaze from that of the erotic feminine, once he has entered the space of the grove, a fundamental element in the recovery of the Indo-European post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior. Like Irish Leborcham, Bona Dea's foreseeing hag serves as a lynchpin joining the violent approach of the raging warrior and the exhibiting of the host of nude women.

9.5 Roman Ritual

In the aetiological account of the *Nonae Caprotinae*, the same structural and functional position is occupied by the variously named leader of the Roman slave-women who leave the city and make their way to the camp of the threatening Latin army. Reminiscent of Ossetic Satana, this leader is wise and perceptive. It is she who develops a plan, who knows what to do (αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ τοῦτο συμβουλεύσασα 'for she was the one providing this counsel' Ps-Plutarch *Parallela* 30); as the Roman magistrates waffle in a state of *aporia* (Plutarch *Rom.* 29.4), she counsels them in the proper course of action – to send the slave-women into the enemy camp – and τὰ λοιπὰ δ' αὐτῇ μελήσειν 'she will take care of the rest' (*Cam.* 33.3). The magistrates are persuaded.

We saw in Chapter 1 (§1.3) that in his account of the incident in the *Life of Romulus* (29.5–6), Plutarch writes that after the Latin enemy warriors had fallen asleep, Philotis (or Tutola) gave a fire signal from a certain wild fig tree (an ἐρινεός [which, we are told, the Romans call καπρίφικος, i.e., *caprificus*]), shielding the signal from the Latins περισχοῦσα προκαλύμμασι καὶ παραπετάσμασιν ὄπισθεν 'while holding out coverings and hangings behind her'. In Plutarch's *Life of Camillus*, we read that this is what happens after the Roman slave-women are ensconced within the enemy camp (33.4):

> νύκτωρ δὲ τὰς μὲν ἄλλας ὑφελέσθαι τὰ ἐγχειρίδια τῶν πολεμίων, τὴν δ' εἴτε Τουτούλαν εἴτε Φιλωτίδα προσβᾶσαν ἐρινεῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ παρατείνασαν ὀπίσω τὸ ἱμάτιον ἆραι πυρσὸν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, ὥσπερ ἦν συγκείμενον αὐτῇ πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας, οὐδενὸς ἄλλου τῶν πολιτῶν εἰδότος.
>
> And during the night the other women secreted away the swords of the enemy, but Tutula, or Philotis, went up into a wild fig tree and after stretching out her cloak behind her, extended a torch toward Rome, just as had been agreed between the magistrates and herself, without the knowledge of any other citizen.

The telecommunicative act of the signal torch, with the improbable screen to account for the enemy's ignorance of the signaling event, is seminal to the account. We noted earlier (in §1.3) that Macrobius preserves it as well (*Sat.*1.11.39), though without detailing the scenario: after the exhausted enemy was asleep, the women (led by Tutela or Philotis) *ex arbore caprifico quae castris erat proxima signum Romanis dederunt* 'gave a signal to the Romans from a *caprificus* that was near the camp'.

Tutula – again like Upaśruti and Leborcham – mediates between the two essential spaces that recur in the mythic traditions of the post-

traumatic dysfunctional warrior: the space of the society of the warrior – urban Rome in the case of the aetiologies of the rites of July 5 and 7 – and a remote space into which or from which the warrior passes; this latter space is that of the dysfunctional warrior's retreat (Indra, Hercules/Semo Sancus) or that of the combat in which the warrior is possessed with an unabating rage that will be turned against his own society (CúChulainn, Horatius). In doing so, Tutula, like her various Indo-European mythic counterparts, facilitates resolution of the warrior-crisis. In the Romulaean aetiology of the Poplifugia, the distant space – the space beyond the *pomerium* – is the space of the crisis of the vanished Romulus, a thinly veiled reworking of the notion of the space of the warrior's retreat, of the warrior's hiding. In the alternative aetiology, involving an invading army, that one in which Tutula and her Roman slave-women figure prominently, the remote space is again a warrior space – it is the space of the encamped enemy, the presence of which precipitates the Roman warrior-crisis, a crisis in the realm of physical force that is resolved by the action of members of the realm of fertility and sensuality. The clairvoyance of the mediating feminine figure that recurs in the various mythic reflexes of the Indo-European tradition finds an equivalence in Tutula's fire signal transmitted across space to the Roman magistrates who are awaiting guidance: a historicized and naturalized expression of the motif of distant perceptivity.

9.5.1 Fire and the Feminine

But there is more: Tutula and the signal torch *both* serve a revelatory function. This coupling of the clairvoyant female and fire in Roman mythic-historic tradition recapitulates the duality of the Indra-discovery episodes that the Epic poets introduced into the account of the *Mahābhārata*. The two variants – the discovery of Indra by the Fire god Agni and his discovery by Upaśruti, the spirit of divination – are presented as sequential events in the *Udyogaparvan* (*Mahābhārata* 5; see §8.4.1.2). And not only is there a concatenation of the alternative episodes, but Agni himself is said to have taken on the fabulous form of a woman as he searched through the world for the hidden Indra.

In an analysis of Chapter 8 (see §8.4.1.2.1), I noted that the element of the feminine and the element of the fire are so deeply engrained in the *Mahābhārata* tradition of the post-traumatic dysfunctional Indra that they can amalgamate as an Agni of feminine morphology – and queried the prospect of this Indic amalgamation's possibly being an inheritance of a more primitive Indo-European condition. What this aetion of the Roman ritual complex of July 5 and July 7 suggests is

precisely that: Rome similarly attests an amalgamation of the revelatory elements of fire and feminine – Tutula and fire conspire to inform and bring resolution to the warrior-crisis. A common inheritance of Indo-European tradition is suggested. In that same discussion I noted that there are two feminine elements involved in the search for Indra with which Agni could conceivably be amalgamated: the clairvoyant and the erotic – that is, Upaśruti, the guiding divinatory spirit, and Śacī, the object of Nahuṣa's erotic desires. The cognate Roman tradition does little to bring additional clarification, to the extent that the clairvoyant feminine, Tutula, is no less a member of the erotically charged delegation of slave-women.

9.5.1.1 The Feminine Without the Fire.

It was noted in the same discussion (§8.4.1.2.1) that the poets of the *Mahābhārata* preserve a variant structuring of the search for Indra. In the account of the *Śāntiparvan* (*Mahābhārata* 12), Upaśruti and Śacī again seek out the warrior god together, and then Śacī alone goes in search of him a second time. Agni is left out of the picture altogether.

Remarkably, there is a variant aetiology concerning the sagacious and perceptive leader of the slave-women that similarly denudes the Roman tradition of the presence of fire. As we saw earlier, in *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30, Ps-Plutarch records a variant signaling tradition:[12] the leader of the women, here called Rhetana, uses a wild fig tree to pull herself εἰς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ μηνύει τοῖς ὑπάτοις 'onto the wall and disclose [things] to the consuls'. The use of fire to send a distant signal from the remote locus of warrior-crisis is absent from the account; the tradition of the wild fig remains, but the tree is now used as a means of mechanically placing the leader of the slave-women in the presence of the civil authorities within urban Rome, to whom she can immediately dispense her advice.

9.5.2 Naming the Clairvoyant Woman

In *Parallela Graeca et Romana* 30, Ps-Plutarch's lexical choices are interesting.[13] To denote the enunciative signaling act of the sagacious head of the women's delegation, the author uses the verb μηνύω, fundamentally meaning 'to disclose what is secret, to reveal': these are denotations precisely in keeping with the actions of the clairvoyant female in the several Indo-European traditions, if the clairvoyant proxy of fire is absent from this particular Roman account. The wise woman is here called Ῥητᾶνα (Rhetana). In this Greek-language reporting of the tradition, the name of the leader of the Roman slave-women has been Hellenized: the resulting name is transparently built on the formant that one finds in, for example, ῥητός 'that which can be

enunciated';[14] compare ῥῆσις 'speech, tale'; ῥῆμα 'word, saying'; and so on – all derived from the root of ἐρῶ 'I will say, speak'. That this is the intended sense of the name is underscored by Ps-Plutarch, who parenthetically remarks following its mention: αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ τοῦτο συμβουλεύσασα 'for she it was who had given the advice in this matter'. The semantic similarity of this name to that of the Indic mediating feminine, the divinatory voice Upaśruti, 'report', is uncanny, if the verbal notions on which they are built denote two complementary communicative processes: Sanskrit *upa-śru-* 'to listen to'; Greek ἐρῶ 'I will say, speak'.

The same Greek root (that of ἐρῶ) is the source of ἀπ-ερῶ, which we saw earlier (see §3.5) to provide the derived adjective ἀπόρρητος, denoting that which is 'off-limits', qualifying the space of the disappearance of Romulus, space of the Volcanal, shrine of the fire god Vulcan (see §3.3). In the aetiological account preserved by Ps-Plutarch, an enunciative act fundamental to the Roman ritual observances of July 5 and July 7 has effectively coalesced with the equally fundamental role of fire in the recovery of the warrior.

Regarding the other names assigned to the leader of the slave-women – Philotis, also Hellenized, is likely intended to evoke her equally erotic nature; so Coarelli: "Non è necessario illustrare l'evidente connessione che questo presenta con il campo semantico della *philia*, intesa qui evidentemente in senso erotico."[15] Tutula/Tutola/Tutela has been similarly interpreted as carrying a fundamentally erotic sense: Coarelli would link the name to that of the phallic god Tutunus/Tutinus/Titinus,[16] as had Wissowa and Radke before him.[17]

The etymology would not be an improbable one, but more probable is a link to the goddess Tutulina/Tutilina, protector of grain in storage (whom we briefly encountered in §3.3.1), given the nexus of affiliations that draw this goddess into the ritual web of July 5 and July 7.[18] Augustine (*De civ. D.* 4.8) includes Tutilina in a set of three goddesses who conspire in protecting grain: Seia protects the grain while it is beneath the soil; Segetia does so at the time it sprouts through the soil and as it grows in the field; and Tutilina then takes over, protecting it after harvest. Tertullian (*De spect.* 8) writes that an image of the goddess is displayed in the Circus Maximus, adding she is called Tutulina *a tutela fructuum* 'from her protection of the crops'.[19] As we saw in §1.4.1, on the day of the Nonae Caprotinae, July 7, sacrifice is made to another deity of stored grain, the god Consus: the *sacerdotes publici* 'public priests' conduct the rites on the god's altar in the Circus Maximus (Tertullian *De spect.* 5). There are thus two deities of stored grain, Consus and Tutulina, both represented within the

Circus Maximus, and one of whom, Consus, is plainly celebrated in conjunction with the rites of the ritual complex of the Poplifugia/ Nonae Caprotinae, the latter thoroughly saturated with notions of fecundity and fruitfulness. We saw too (§3.3.1) that Tutulina appears to be the goddess whom Pliny (*HN* 18.8) identifies as she of the ineffable name (at least *sub tecto* 'indoors'),[20] and that Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 2.31.3) identifies the god of the subterranean altar in the Circus, that is, Consus, as a god whose name was not to be spoken. Like Augustine, Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.16.7) includes the three deities Seia, Segetia, and Tutilina in a set, adding to it the pair Salus and Semonia, writing that in ancient times, if anyone should say the name of one of these five, that person would then be required to observe *feriae*, a religious festival – all further expressions of language of the forbidden. Consus was by folk etymology linked to Latin *consilium* 'deliberation, counsel'; the sagacious Tutula/Tutola/Tutela provides counsel to the Roman authorities when the invading Latins demand Roman women. Romulus made a vow to Consus ἀπορρήτων βουλευμάτων ἡγεμόνι 'to the chief of secret counsels' as he planned the abduction of the Sabine women (*Ant. Rom.* 2.30.3; cf. Livy 1.9.6); accordingly, the Latin demand for Roman women is likened to that Romulaean abduction of Sabines (see Plutarch *Rom.* 29.4). These connections may well be taken to reveal that the leader of the slave-women who is etiologically associated with the ritual complex of July 5 and July 7, Tutula/Tutola/Tutela, has a name derived from that of Consus's collaborator in grain, Tutulina/Tutilina, as Weinstock realized long ago.[21] She who protects Roman grain no less protects the Roman warrior. Tutula personifies the power of the realm of fertility over that of physical might – an additional expression of what we have seen to be a fundamental motif of the myth and ritual of the post-traumatic warrior.

9.6 Some Conclusions

Typically, the resolution of the crisis of the Indo-European traumatized warrior is realized consequent to the intervention of a clairvoyant feminine figure, a sagacious woman who physically and/ or perceptually bridges the gap between the remote space of warrior activity and the near space of society. In India she is Upaśruti, spirit of divination. A functionally comparable figure is found in the Roman tale of the post-combat crisis of Hercules/Semo Sancus in the person of the grizzled old priestess of Bona Dea – not a divine being such as Upaśruti, but a practitioner of the divine arts, of the "science of the priest-magician" (see §1.4.2.1.1).

In Irish tradition, the corresponding figure is Leborcham, one noted for her cognitive conveyances through space on behalf of the Ulster king Conchobor. It is she who remotely perceives and declares the approach of the raging CúChulainn, the consequence of which declaration is the sending out, on Conchobor's orders, of the troop of nude women from Emain Macha. Though not herself a member of that delegation, it would seem, the physically malformed Leborcham, a *ban-chainte*, is in effect the agent responsible for the calling out of that erotic delegation – for its mobilization. As with Upaśruti and Bona Dea's priestess, Leborcham is thus closely aligned with the matrix feature FEMININE EROTICISM, but distinct from it: in each case, the clairvoyant feminine performs a certain guiding function for the erotic. In this regard, Leborcham's role is reminiscent of that of the old hag who leads forth the delegation of fifty young women in the *Tochmarc Étaíne* ('Wooing of Étaín') – alluring young women of identical appearance from whom the king Eochaid Airem must choose his wife. It should be noted, however, that such a distinction between Leborcham the *ban-chainte*, on the one hand, and the erotic feminine, on the other, is not a necessary one in Irish tradition: Riches, that erotic feminine figure of the *Mesca Ulad*, who bares her body before CúChulainn on the field of battle, and by so doing debilitates that warrior, is herself a *ban-chainte*.[22]

In the aetiology of the Roman ritual complex of July 5/7, the erotic delegation has its own mobilizing leader, the wise and knowing Tutula (etc.) homologue of Upaśruti, the priestess of Bona Dea, and Leborcham. Though in this instance, the alignment of the sagacious feminine with the erotic element is further integrated, with Tutula herself forming a part of that delegation. Such an amalgamation is underscored by her alternative name Philotis; at the same time, her ultimate cognate identity with Indic Upaśruti, spirit of divination, is reinforced by another of her alternative appellations, Rhetana. Though in other expressions of the clairvoyant feminine, something of the professional diviner can be consistently seen in her, in the account of the Nonae Caprotinae she has been fully assigned to the ideological realm of fertility. A similar coalescing of the matrix elements CLAIRVOYANT WOMAN and FEMININE EROTICISM is seen in Nart traditions, in which Satana functions in both roles.

[1] Monier-Williams 1979:208 – also glossed as 'giving ear to, listening attentively'. On the notion 'rumor, report', also see Dumézil 1970:124n21.

[2] Monier-Williams 1979:208, where "T." abbreviates Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati's Dictionary and "Kād." *Kādambarī*.

[3] See Ganguli 1998:4.24.

[4] Hiltebeitel 1977:335.

[5] Colarusso 1989:3.

[6] Colarusso 1989:5.

[7] Colarusso 2002:188. Colarusso entitles the Saga "Satanaya and Bataraz."

[8] Dumézil 1978:38.

[9] Leborcham is the clairvoyant figure in the more complete account of the *Book of Leinster* (lines 1177–1182), as in Recension III (see O'Rahilly 1967:292; Thurneysen 1912:538). In the version of the *Book of the Dun Cow* and the *Yellow Book of Lecan*, it is one identified as *dercaid* 'watchman', who sees the approaching warrior; clairvoyance seems still the operative mode of perception: the "watchman" knows (Recension I, lines 803–805) that the approaching young warrior will shed the blood of every warrior in the *dún* before CúChulainn makes his declaration to that effect (lines 808–809; see §7.3).

[10] See Robinson 1912.

[11] Though Hercules' presence in Rome necessarily precedes Romulus

and the ploughing of the Palatine *pomerium*; see the discussion of these matters in §7.4.2.

[12] In the account that he attributes to the *Italian History* of Aristeides the Milesian.

[13] See Chapter 1, note 12.

[14] Compare names containing –ρητος, such as Ἀντί-ρητος, Εὐθύ-ρητος, Θεό-ρρητος, Κλεό-ρρητος, Νικό-ρρητος; see Fick 1894:247.

[15] Coarelli 1997:29.

[16] Coarelli 1997:29. On Mutinus Titinus, and so on, see Palmer 1974:187–206.

[17] See Wissowa 1899:1552; Radke 1979:80–81, 304–305.

[18] With Tutulina/Tutilina, compare the reference to *Ope Toitesiai* in the archaic Duenos Inscription (CIL I^2 4) of the sixth or fifth century BC.

[19] Not far from the Circus, on the Aventine, near the home of Ennius, a sacred space dedicated to Tutilina was located, according to Varro *Ling.* 5.163.

[20] Pliny also notes, *vis-à-vis* the Roman practice of *evocatio* (the calling out of a deity from a city under siege), that the name of the protecting deity of Rome was necessarily kept secret (*HN* 28.18), and that Rome

itself has an alternative name that it is *nefas* to speak other than at the *arcanis caerimoniarum*. On these matters, see Köves-Zulauf 1972:64–108, especially together with the review of Linderski (1975).

[21] See Weinstock 1936:853. See also Paul Drossart, quoted by Dumézil 1980:248 (reprint and translation of Dumézil 1975:277):

The Τουτούλα (or Τουτόλα) of Plutarch is indeed the Protectress, like Macrobius' *Tutela*, like that *Tutulina* who is more modestly placed in charge of the protection of the harvests (Tertullian, *De Spectaculis*, 8.3) and the *Tutilina* about whom a fragment by Varro (*Satirae Menippeae*, 216) tells us that one could invoke her during a siege.

The latter clause is a reference to the fragment: *non Tutilinam, quam ego ipse invoco, quod meae aures abs te obsidentur*.

[22] See Watson 1941:46.

10 Watery Spaces

10.1 Introduction

Equally fundamental to the Indo-European mythic tradition of the warrior who finds himself in crisis following the trauma of combat, as will have become obvious to the reader by this point, is the presence of water – water that characterizes the space of the warrior's retreat and/or water that is crucial to the restoration of the dysfunctional warrior. This element has now been so often encountered and rehearsed in our investigation of the several attested reflexes of the primitive Indo-European tradition that it will suffice here to summarize its mythic occurrences. A little more will need to be said about its presence in Roman ritual.

10.2 The Indo-Iranian Warrior

The feature APPLICATION OF WATERS is conspicuous not only in Indic Epic but also in the several expressions of Iranian tradition. It is clearly a part of the structural matrix as manifest in Nart Epic and in Moses of Chorene's Armenian song of the dragon-slaying, Heracles-like Vahagn.

10.2.1 The Indic Warrior

In the tradition of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior Indra, the remote space of his retreat is a watery place: he is enveloped within the waters of that locale. It is within a lotus-stalk fiber that tiny Indra hides – a lotus that grows within a lake on an island within a sea (*Mahābhārata* 5.14.5–12). When the traumatized Indra had fled from the space of that society of which he was a part (crossing "nine and ninety streams"; *Rig Veda* 1.32.14 [see §7.2]) following his combat with Vṛtra, it is said that he lived hidden in the waters, wreathing like a snake (*praticchanno 'vasac cāpsu, ceṣṭamāna ivoragaḥ*; *Mahābhārata* 5.10.46). Agni, the Fire, initially is unable to find Indra because of his unwillingness to search the waters: *sadā . . . āpaḥ praveṣṭuṃ notsahāmy aham* 'I myself am always unable to enter the waters' (5.15.31). Agni relents, however, and once that watery locale of the warrior's isolation from society has been identified, the gods and seers travel to it, led by Bṛhaspati, who hymns Indra back into action (5.16.10–20 [see the preceding, especially §§7.5 and 8.4.12]).

10.2.2 The Iranian Warrior

The Nart hero Batraz had been implanted into the back of his father, Xæmyts, when his mother deserted Xæmyts to return to her remote homeland. On the top of a tower, Satana lances the resulting abscess with a steel blade when the moment for birth has arrived; and the infant warrior Batraz plummets flaming from the tower into seven vats of water designed to cool him of his fiery crisis. The quantity is insufficient, however, and Satana must go in search of additional water, which she obtains by sexual exchange; and thereby the fire of Batraz is quenched.[1] The motif recurs in the previously examined Circassian birth accounts of the Nart hero Sawseruquo (see §8.5.2) – a fiery babe cooled by submersion in water, delivered in the presence of Setenaya – or born from her.

Subsequent to his childhood, Ossetic Batraz quits Nart society to live beneath the waters with his mother's family (or in the sky). These waters, localized in remote space, are a conspicuous feature in the Nart traditions about the mother of Batraz. Xæmyts (father of Batraz) met her as he journeyed in a remote region. She lives beneath the sea – a sea-genie or a descendant of the sea god Donbettyr (see §8.4.3.2). She leaves her aquatic home to live among the Narts, but following the conception of Batraz, she deserts her husband and returns to this watery place.

Similarly there is a pronounced element of water in the account of the death of Batraz in which he, having turned his warrior rage against his own people, gives orders that the Narts build for him an enormous funeral pyre. Batraz climbs on top of the burning pyre, but he is unable to be consumed by its flames: the warrior can only die, and so be relieved of his murderous raging, once his sword has been submerged in water. The Narts drop his sword, iconic image of this warrior, into the sea in the midst of a storm; and so submerged, Batraz dies (see §8.4.3.1). The dysfunctional warrior who has turned his battle mania against his own society is calmed.

The element of watery space occurring in conjunction with the "slayer of Vṛtra" also survives in Iranian tradition as attested in the brief Armenian "birth" narrative of Vahagn. The miniature dragon slayer rises, flaming, from within a reed in the purple deep (see §8.4.2.1). The elements involved are undoubtedly cognate with those of Indra Vṛtrahan's watery place of retreat, from which he arises, his *balam* regained, by the hymning of Bṛhaspati.

10.3 The Irish Warrior

Leborcham perceives the approach of the post-traumatic raging warrior CúChulainn, whose homicidal furor will be turned against his own people, the Ulaid. So forewarned, the king Conchobor takes the appropriate action and sends out a nude delegation of the women of Ulster to expose themselves lewdly to the dysfunctional CúChulainn (see §8.2). The warrior averts his glance upon seeing the women, and when he does so he is subdued by other warriors of Ulster, who submerge him in a vat of cooling-water (*Táin Bó Cúailnge*, Recension I, lines 815–818):

> *Maitti immi-seom in dabach hísin. In dabach aile dano in ro lád, fichis dornaib de. In tress dabach i ndeochaid iar sudiu, fosngert-side combo chuimsi dó a tess ⁊ a fuacht.*
>
> This vat burst around him. The second tub into which he was thrown boiled with fist-size bubbles from that. The third vat into which he went afterward, he heated it so that its heat and its coldness were suitable for him.

And sain tíagait fergga in meic for cúlu ‘thus the *ferg* (pl.) of the young warrior retreats’ (*Book of Leinster* line 1197). The element of water is again crucial to the restoration of the post-traumatic warrior.

This calming and restoration of the Irish hero occurs not in a remote space but in proximity to the *dún* of Emain Macha, within the domain of the society of the Ulaid. As we have seen, in this Celtic reflex of the Indo-European myth of the dysfunctional warrior, as in the Roman tradition of Horatius, the remote space is the space of the hero’s combat, locale of the source of his trauma, and from that remote space he flees back to the space of society, importing a maniacal, unabated rage. Though the directionality of flight, and thus the relative loci of combat and social impairment, are reversed relative to the Indic case (on which, see the summary remarks of §7.6), the remote space of this Irish tradition – the space of combat – is itself one in which water is conspicuously present. In that distant locale, CúChulainn violates a *geis* of the sons of Nechta Scéne by casting a withe into the river that flows by the *dún* of those three terrible brothers, and so alerts them to his presence (see §7.3). Combat is conducted against the brother Fannall within a ford of the river (*Condrecat íarom issind áth* [*Táin Bó Cúailnge*, Recension I, line 746]), or on the surface of the river beneath which Fannall will sink as they struggle, then to be decapitated by CúChulainn (*Book of Leinster* lines 1142–1143).

10.4 The Italic Warrior

The remote – trans-*pomerial* – space of the Aventine into which Hercules/Semo Sancus flees seeking relief from the post-traumatic fiery fury (*aestus*) and rage (*ira*) that have overwhelmed him following his destruction of Cacus (see §8.3) is one that is fundamentally defined by the presence of water. It is *femineae loca clausa deae fontesque piandos* 'a space enclosed for women's goddess and springs for cleansing' (Propertius 4.9.25); it is the sound of the water within the space that draws the tormented hero (4.9.35); the old priestess characterizes the grove as a place of *avia secreti limitis unda* 'a remote stream of hidden course' (4.9.60). The warrior-in-crisis forces his way within the confines of the watery space, and there the waters of the stream extinguish his debilitating heat.

10.5 Roman Ritual

In the aetiology of the ritual complex of July 5 and July 7, the disappearance (apotheosis) of Romulus in the distant (trans-*pomerial*) space of the Campus Martius is localized in proximity to a watery place – the *Caprae Palus* 'Goat's Marsh'. Latin *palus* (*palūs*, *palūdis*) denotes a swamp or some similar area covered with standing water, even floodwater (as in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 8.696). Contrasting *palus* with *lacus* 'lake, pond, reservoir' and *stagnum* 'pool', Varro (*Ling.* 5.26) folk-etymologizes the term by links to *paulum* 'small amount' and *palam* 'openly; discernibly': *Palus paulum aquae in altitudinem et palam latius diffusae* 'a *palus* is a *paulum* of water in terms of depth and *palam* in being broadly extended'. Martial uses *palus* metonymically to denote 'reed', as in 11.32.2. It is a word of great antiquity, of Indo-European origin: compare Russian *polovod'e* 'high water';[2] compare too Sanskrit *palvalam* 'pool, pond'; Old High German *felawa* 'willow'.[3]

Latin *capra* 'female goat' (*caper* 'male goat') is no less primitive. The source is ancestral Indo-European *kapros 'male goat', the origin also of Umbrian *kabru*, Old Norse *hafr*, Old English *hæfer*, all denoting 'male goat', and Greek κάπρος 'boar'; compare Old Irish *gabor*, Welsh *gafr* 'male goat'. Sanskrit *kapṛth-* 'penis' must be related and may preserve the sense of an ancestral etymon from which *kapros 'male goat' was morphologically derived.[4] The notional randiness of the occasion of the Nonae Caprotinae finds aetiological expression in its very name, and in the name primitively assigned to the moist locale central to the aetion.

10.5.1 The Caprae Palus

In his *Life of Romulus*, after rehearsing scenarios of Romulus's murder

and dismemberment, Plutarch then addresses the alternative tradition concerning the vanishing of Rome's first warrior king (27.6–7):

> ἀλλὰ τυχεῖν μὲν ἔξω περὶ τὸ καλούμενον αἰγὸς ἕλος ἐκκλησίαν ἄγοντα τὸν Ῥωμύλον, ἄφνω δὲ θαυμαστὰ καὶ κρείττονα λόγου περὶ τὸν ἀέρα πάθη γενέσθαι καὶ μεταβολὰς ἀπίστους· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἡλίου τὸ φῶς ἐπιλιπεῖν, νύκτα δὲ κατασχεῖν, οὐ πρᾳεῖαν, οὐδὲ ἥσυχον, ἀλλὰ βροντάς τε δεινὰς καὶ πνοὰς ἀνέμων ζάλην ἐλαυνόντων πανταχόθεν ἔχουσαν·
>
> But others say that it happened outside the city near the place called the Goat's Marsh when Romulus was mustering an assembly; and all of a sudden there were fantastic happenings in the air, beyond reasonable accounting, incredible modulations. For the light of the sun vanished and night took hold – not peacefully and quietly – but instead there was both terrible thunder and blasts of wind that drove rain from all directions.

Similarly, at *Life of Numa* 2.1–2, Plutarch writes:

> πέμπτῃ δὲ ἱσταμένου μηνός, ἣν νῦν ἡμέραν νώνας Καπρατίνας καλοῦσι, θυσίαν τινὰ δημοτελῆ πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ὁ Ῥωμύλος ἔθυε περὶ τὸ καλούμενον Αἰγὸς ἕλος, καὶ παρῆν ἥ τε βουλὴ καὶ τοῦ δήμου τὸ πλεῖστον. ἐξαίφνης δὲ μεγάλης περὶ τὸν ἀέρα τροπῆς γενομένης καὶ νέφους ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐρείσαντος ἅμα πνεύματι καὶ ζάλῃ, ...
>
> And on the fifth day of July – the day that they now call the Nonae Capratinae – Romulus was offering certain public sacrifices before the city in the vicinity of what they call the Goat's Marsh, and the Senate and most of the *populus* was on hand. Suddenly there was a great change (τροπή) in the air and a cloud descended upon the earth with wind and rain, . . .

And again at *Life of Camillus* 33.7, he writes regarding the source of the name of the Capratine Nones:

> . . . τὴν γὰρ αἶγα κάπραν ὀνομάζουσιν· ὁ δὲ Ῥωμύλος ἠφανίσθη δημηγορῶν περὶ τὸ τῆς αἰγὸς ἕλος προσαγορευόμενον, . . .
>
> . . . for they call 'goat' *capra*; and Romulus vanished while addressing the *populus* near the place called the Goat's Marsh, . . .

In Chapter 6 we examined the relative evaluation of the historicity of the variant accounts of Romulus's disappearance. Picking up where we left off with Dionysius of Halicarnassus's words on the subject at

Antiquitates Romanae 2.56.2 (see §6.2.3.1), we read:

> . . . περὶ ἧς πολλοὶ παραδέδονται λόγοι καὶ διάφοροι. Οἱ μὲν οὖν μυθωδέστερα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ ποιοῦντες ἐκκλησιάζοντά φασιν αυτὸν ἐπὶ στρατοπέδου ζόφου κατασκήψαντος ἐξ αἰθρίας καὶ χειμῶνος μεγάλου καταρραγέντος ἀφανῆ γενέσθαι καὶ πεπιστεύκασιν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Ἄρεος τὸν ἄνδρα ἀνηρπάσθαι.

> . . . regarding this [disappearance] many and different accounts are offered. Those making more mythic accounts about him say that while he was giving an address in the Campus, gloomy darkness rushed down from the sky and a great storm broke, and then he was not to be seen; and they believe that the man was snatched up by his father Mars.

As was noted in §2.2.1, Ovid cites the locale of the disappearance as the Goat's Marsh, and furthermore does so in conjunction with reference to a deluge from the sky (*Fasti* 2:491–496):[5]

> *Est locus, antiqui Caprae dixere paludem*:
> *Forte tuis illic, Romule, iura dabas*.
> *Sol fugit, et removent subeuntia nubila caelum*,
>
> *Et gravis effusis decidit imber aquis*.
> *Hinc tonat, hinc missis abrumpitur ignibus aether:*
> *Fit fuga, rex patriis astra petebat equis*.
> There is a place, the ancients called it the Goat's Marsh;
> There, Romulus, you were giving folk justice.
> The sun flees and looming stormclouds steal the sky,
> Heavy rain tumbles in a downpour.
> Thunder roars, and the fire-bolts split the air;
> People flee; the king soared starward on his father's steeds.

Livy (1.16.1–2) records the same, though without specific mention of the soaking rains:[6]

> *His inmortalibus editis operibus cum ad exercitum recensendum contionem in campo ad Caprae paludem haberet, subito coorta tempestas cum magno fragore tonitribusque tam denso regem operuit nimbo ut conspectum eius contioni abstulerit; nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit.*
>
> When these undying deeds were accomplished and [Romulus] was holding an assembly for the sake of reviewing his warriors near the Goat's Marsh, all of a sudden a storm came up with great

sizzling and thunder and it enveloped the king in a dense cloud so that it cut him off from the sight of the assembly; and from that time Romulus was no longer on earth.

10.5.1.1 Site of the Goat's Marsh.

The location of this Caprae Palus ('Goat's Marsh') within the Campus Martius is uncertain. It is often proposed that it was situated in the vicinity of the Pantheon, "the lowest part of the Campus Martius," stretching "towards the Tiber."[7] Coarelli suggests a roughly west by northwest extension toward the river, with the eastern extremity of this swamp running from about the area of the Pantheon in the north down to the Theater of Pompey and related structures in the south – a marshy area of some significant extent.[8] Were the temple of Vulcan *in Campo* to be identified with the small structure marked within the Crypta of Balbus on the Severan Marble Plan (see §3.2.3), the space separating the temple from the nearest edge of the Caprae Palus would then be somewhere between 200 and 300 meters, along a northwest to southeast axis.

10.5.1.2 Stormy Weather.

The aetiology of the disappearance of Romulus in the Campus Martius, a reworking of the primitive Indo-European tradition of the warrior-crisis acted out in remote space, is fundamentally associated with a watery locale. As we have just observed, ground waters figure in the Romulaean aetiology, as they do in the Indic and Italic traditions of the retreat of Hercules/Semo Sancus and Indra, respectively. But the waters of that aetiology are not limited to the swamp of the Campus Martius near which the *in Campo* rites of the Nonae Caprotinae are celebrated (Plutarch *Rom.* 29.2). There is also a soaking rain – an inundation that comes on suddenly and violently, a preternatural occurrence that defies reasonable description. Romulus's remote space is a watery locale, and like Indra, Batraz, Vahagn, CúChulainn, and Hercules/Semo Sancus, he is immersed within waters: Romulus is caught in a deluge and engulfed by a dark mist. There is here a further particular linkage with the Ossetic Batraz, who, like Romulus, quits his earthly life in the midst of a storm, as his sword, iconic image of that heroic Nart, is dropped into the sea.

10.5.2 The Comitium

The topography just described is that of what I have labeled the larger Poplifugium (see §4.5). If a watery space is fundamental to the ritual complex of July 5/7, then the space of what I have proposed to be the historically earlier rites, the smaller Poplifugium (see §4.4), celebrated

in the ancient Comitium along the edge of the Forum Romanum, must also have its own form of the same. The archaic Forum Romanum was a low-lying area prone to flooding from the Tiber,[9] in addition to having its own copious supply of ground water. Commenting on the swamps and lakes of early Rome (in the Campus Martius, the area of the Forum Boarium and Circus Maximus, and still other sites), Aldrete writes: "These watery regions were fed by at least 22 natural springs within the central section of Rome, with a number concentrated in the Forum Romanum area."[10] And again, "The Forum originally was a swampy zone crisscrossed by streams, and even when drained by sewers such as the Cloaca Maxima[11] and with its level raised by fill, the area remained flood-prone."[12]

10.5.2.1 Tiber Floods.

While the Campus Martius and the Forum Romanum are amply supplied with ground water year round, an inundation there would, in light of Tiber flood data collected from the Middle Ages to the present day, be most likely to occur between the months of November and February: according to Aldrete, these "four consecutive months . . . account for more than 83% of the historical floods (25 of 30) and more than 77% of the modern ones (59 of 76)."[13] The season of most-expected flooding thus exists roughly in complementary distribution with the calendrically demarcated war-making season, that period that begins with the parading of the Salii (in March) and ends with the celebration of the Armilustrium on October 19.

The limited data that survive from antiquity do not show close conformity to this pattern, however. Of the six Roman floods that Aldrete considers to be "precisely dated," two occurred in March and three are distributed across the months of May, July, and August. The July flood of 13 BC is a curiosity to the extent that it occurred on July 4, the day before the Poplifugia. In addition to referring to the datable flood of mid-March AD 69, Ovid's *Fasti* couplet on the Second Equirria (March 14 – the day of the Mamuralia) would seem to suggest at least an occasional interruption of the races by a flooding Tiber (3.521–522):[14]

> *Qui tamen eiecta si forte tenebitur unda,*
> *Caelius accipiet pulverulentus equos.*
> But if [the Campus] is clasped by the river's flood,
> The dusty Caelian will take the horses.

There are other references in ancient sources to floods at particular times, though Aldrete considers these to be in some way less certain:

of these, one is a flood that Livy records as occurring at the time of the Ludi Apollinares – the games established in 212 BC following a reading of the *Carmina Marciana*[15] and the Sibylline Books.[16] From 208 BC the games had regularly fallen on July 13. Over time, their celebration was extended, so that the first day of the games came to fall on July 6, the day between the Poplifugia and the Nonae Caprotinae: in the *Fasti Maffeiani*, *Amiternini*, and *Antiates Ministrorum domus Augustae*, the games are marked as spanning the inclusive period of July 6 to July 13.

Livy (30.38.6–12) lists several portents that occurred in 202 BC at the time that word of a Carthaginian rebellion reached Rome: a partial eclipse of the sun and a shower of stones at Cumae; sink holes in the area of Velitrae; lighting strikes in the forum at Aricia and on the walls and a gate at Frusino; a shower of stones on the Palatine; and a flood of the Tiber that inundated the Circus Maximus, so that the *ludi* 'games' of Apollo had to be relocated outside of the Porta Collina in the area in which the temple of Venus of Eryx would later be built (one of those temples located beyond the *pomerium*; Vitruvius 1.7.1[17]). That Livy can include a July flood of the Circus Maximus in a list of portents suggests that flooding at midsummer – or at least flooding during the celebration of the Ludi Apollinares – is something of an anomaly. Aldrete considers the departure of the ancient evidence from the pattern documented since the Middle Ages to be a function of the paucity of reliably datable floods in antiquity: ". . . it is impossible to draw any mathematically significant conclusions from such a small data set."[18]

What can one conclude from all of these considerations? First, the ritual complex of July 5 and July 7 was held during a period in which the seasonally flood-prone areas of the Forum Romanum and the Campus Martius were unlikely to be flooded in a typical year – and, concomitantly, we might further note, at a time of the year in which active military campaigning was apt to be underway. In any given year, this latter factor might well define the constituency of the *populus* available to take part in the rites.

Second, the topography of both the Forum Romanum and the Campus Martius in early periods was such that marshy areas and abundant ground water feature prominently. Our sources are explicit about the significance of the Caprae Palus 'Goat's Marsh' for the Nonae Capratinae – the very source of the name of the festival, writes Plutarch (*Life of Camillus* 33.7). The most recent geological examinations of the Comitium and surrounding areas reveal that the area of the primitive Comitium belonged to the topographical region of the Forum and constituted a rim elevated above the Forum basin

matched by the rim located opposite, where stood the Regia and the Temple of Vesta.[19] The early Comitium was thus perched on the edge of the Forum basin with its natural springs. Beyond its proximity to the Forum springs, the Comitium would have bordered on standing water at times, though likely not typically during early July.[20] A core sample in the Forum basin suggests alternating periods of standing water and dry ground rather than permanently standing pools.[21]

Particular worked water features figure in the topography of the Comitium as well. In Chapter 3 we discussed the set of monuments that preserve elements of the archaic sanctuary of Vulcan along the edge of the Comitium (dated ca. 580 BC): a U-shaped altar, the lower part of a column, and a damaged, inscribed *cippus*; as pointed out in that discussion (§3.2.2.2), the *cippus* is the earliest of these three elements. This Volcanal altar had been constructed above a still-earlier open pool, beside which "there was an artificially cut basin, apparently made to assist in drawing water."[22] In addition, Ammerman's recent investigation of the Comitium has provided "evidence that the ground level on the east side was artificially lowered (in places by more than 1 m) at a time before the first pavement of the Comitium was installed."[23] One of the effects of the lowering of the ground level, Ammerman suggests, would have been to emphasize topographically the naturally elevated area in the west of the Comitium, where a deposit of the volcanic tuff called *cappellaccio* created a conspicuously raised relief, the lowest of a series of such outcrops that extended up the lower slope of the Capitoline: "elevated, rostra-like structures that readily could be used for ritual or ceremonial purposes."[24] Ammerman continues:

> In this context, we gain a better sense of why, in keeping with literary tradition, this area was such an attractive place for some of the earliest altars in Rome. What made the outcrop of rock at the Comitium of particular interest or consequence was its position at the head of a series. As a conspicuous natural feature perched at the edge of the Forum basin, it marked a prominent spot on the landscape – one that the early Romans appropriately endowed with significance.

The lowering of the ground level was particularly great, nearly two meters, at points along a line east by northeast of the later-installed Lapis Niger, probable site of the Volcanal.[25] As we noted in §4.4, Ammerman observes that this makes for a condition in keeping with Festus's (p. 290M) statement that the Volcanal *est supra Comitium* 'is above the Comitium'.[26]

Prior to the installation of the first pavement of the Comitium, at which time the area of lowered ground would have been filled in,[27] those excavated areas would likely have become pools of standing water during the wetter portions of the year: “Even today the whole low excavated area under the roof in glass blocks often fills up with water in December and January. The soil below appears to be rather impermeable.”[28] The impermeability of the soil also means that in any time of year, the same area could conceivably have served for temporary pooling of water for the sake of ritual landmarking – or for any other desired ritual purpose – in the period prior to the putting down of the first pavement of the Comitium. If a need continued for such a cult pool within the confines of the Comitium after it was paved, additional structures or alternative solutions would have undoubtedly been provided.

10.6 Some Conclusions

Water plays a central role in the recovery of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior. It is conspicuously present in the several reflexes of the primitive Indo-European mythic tradition: Indra lies hidden beneath the waters that fill his remote place of retreat; Semo Sancus’s debilitating heat is cooled by the flowing stream of Bona Dea’s grove; CúChulainn is robbed of his *ferg* in vats of cold water; Batraz’s fiery ardor is quenched by repeated immersions in standing water. In each case, the traumatized warrior arises from these healing waters restored – the functional warrior once more – much as the dragon-slayer Vahagn is depicted as “born” from within waters in the song preserved by Moses of Chorene. In each case, the warrior’s aqueous ministrations are essentially linked to figures and/or notions of fertility and sensuality. Movement through space is fundamental: the Indic, Irish, and Italic warriors each pass from the space of combat trauma into the space of immersion in waters; Ossetic tradition transparently preserves elements of the motif.

Roman ritual tradition shows agreement with the evidence of myth. Within the boundaries of the Comitium and those of the Campus Martius – both, I have argued, spaces for the celebration of the ritual complex of July 5 and July 7 – areas of standing water come into play. A basin and an excavated cavity can be observed in archaic levels of the Comitium (smaller Poplifugium); the Caprae Palus is central to the aetiology (and etymology) of the ritual complex (larger Poplifugium). Movement is again central: the *populus Romanus* ritually moves into each space in response to warrior trauma, and Romulus is explicitly depicted as entering the space of the Campus Martius in the vicinity of the Caprae Palus – the space of his disappearance.

[1] Colarusso (1989:5) calls attention to Satanaya's association with water in his (Colarusso's) discussion of the Nart myth that he calls "The Blossom of Lady Satanaya" (reported in Hadaghat'la I, 1:81).

[2] Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995:304, citing Trubačev 1972.

[3] Ernout and Meillet 1959:478.

[4] See Mallory and Adams 2006: 141; 1997:229, 507, with bibliography.

[5] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:41–42.

[6] See also Florus 1.1.1.16–17, as well as Cicero *De republica* 1.16.25 and Plutarch *De fortuna Romanorum* 8, where (in the two last-named) an eclipse is invoked in conjunction with the apotheosis (discussed in §2.2.1).

[7] Platner 1929:98. See also Richardson 1992:70.

[8] Coarelli 1997:16 map 2. See the associated discussion on pp. 17–60.

[9] For general discussion, see Aldrete 2007:44–49.

[10] Aldrete 2007:54–55.

[11] The great drain called the Cloaca Maxima was attributed to the Tarquins: to Tarquinius Priscus according to Pliny (*HN* 104–108); to Superbus according to Livy 1.38.6; 56.2 (cited by Aldrete). On the Cloaca Maxima, see Aldrete 2007:170–173.

[12] Aldrete 2007:205.

[13] Aldrete 2007:66.

[14] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:70.

[15] The collected prophetic utterances of a seer Marcius, on which see, *inter alia*, Wissowa 1971:536–537; Schilling 1991a:588, 595, with bibliography.

[16] See Macrobius *Sat.* 1.17.26–30; Livy 25.12.1–15.

[17] See Woodard 2006:83, 152–154.

[18] Aldrete 2007:70; see Aldrete for additional discussion.

[19] See Ammerman 1996:134.

[20] Ammerman writes: "During wetter times of the year, there would have been standing water in the low central part of the basin just to the south of the site."

[21] Writing on the lack of evidence for a standing swamp in the

Velabrum, Ammerman notes (2006:307n28): “We have observed the same situation in the Forum basin, where one of our cores yielded direct evidence for seasonality in the form of calcium root-casts. Such casts are seen as wavy white lines that precipitate around the roots of a plant when soil is subject to alternating wet and dry conditions.”

[22] Holloway 1994:83, 86.

[23] Ammerman 1996:135.

[24] Ammerman 1996:135.

[25] See Ammerman 1996:126, Figure 2, points 4 and 11

[26] See Ammerman 1996:135n101.

[27] See Ammerman 1996:135, who writes:

. . . when it eventually became time to install the first pavement, some volume of fills would have been required in order to bring the ground up again to the desired level. Thus we have to think in terms of two interventions that involved the purposeful modification of the land surface on the east side of the site: first the local decapitation of the natural land surface and then the filling back in of the low area artificially created.

[28] Ammerman, personal communication.

11 Return to Order

11.1 Introduction

There remains to be discussed one additional matrix feature that is common to the major cognate expressions of the Indo-European myth of the warrior in crisis, one that concerns the aftermath of the warrior's recovery. The security of society has been threatened by the dysfunctional condition of one whose role it is to protect society – by the warrior's retreat from society or by his rage turned against it. With the restoration of the warrior, however, accomplished by the intervention of society, there is a return of proper societal order. This return of order is accompanied by acts of inauguration or *de facto* installation.

11.2 The Indo-Iranian Warrior

Indic and Iranian reflexes of the primitive Indo-European myth of the post-traumatic warrior equally preserve expressions of this achievement of societal order, though the manner in which it is realized shows variation. Both of the two realizations of warrior dysfunctionality present themselves, and distinctive solutions are thus required: on the one hand, there is a reintroduction into society of the warrior who has been in a state of retreat; on the other, there is a removal from society of the threat posed by the warrior's furor.

11.2.1 The Indic Warrior

Both the Fire god Agni and Indra's wife Śacī (or Śacī alone) led by Upaśruti, spirit of divination, locate Indra in the remote, watery hiding place to which he has fled following his combat with Vṛtra. Indra instructs Śacī in a plan by which the lustfully gazing Nahuṣa, stand-in for the warrior in retreat, can be removed from the throne. A delegation of the society from which Indra had fled – gods, seers, gandharvas – subsequently travels to his remote locale of hiding, and there the divine priest Bṛhaspati hymns Indra back into action. When, by Bṛhaspati's praises, Indra has grown large again and regained his *balam*, word arrives of the downfall of Nahuṣa, per Indra's stratagem. Order is restored to society, and Indra, the recovered warrior, is re-inaugurated as king of the gods.

11.2.2 The Iranian Warrior

Elements of the return-to-order feature remain visible in Nart tradition, if redistributed in the evolving Epic of the descendants of the Iranian Scythians, passed on to neighboring non-Indo-European peoples of the Caucasus. Ossetic Batraz is born from his father's back and falls flaming into vats of cooling water. After repeated applications, his fiery steel is tempered; his consuming heat is quenched. The warrior thus enters upon his proper role in Nart society, much as Armenian Vahagn, who, following his flaming "birth," goes on to perform Herculean tasks and become the dragon slayer – a role proclaimed *mutatis mutandis* by his name. Batraz, however, subsequently turns his warrior rage against Nart society and slaughters his own people. The societal disorder of the homicidal warrior will be ended as Batraz is once again overwhelmed by flames, this time on his funeral pyre; but he is able to die only when his sword, icon of the hero, is submerged in the sea, and the periodic fulgent reappearance of the sword, and so the hero, is thus inaugurated.

11.3 The Irish Warrior

The young CúChulainn is robbed of that warrior mania – *ferg* – that had threatened the society of the Ulaid when, having averted his gaze from the lewd assemblage of Scandlach (or Mugain, in the *Book of the Dun Cow* and the *Yellow Book of Lecan*) and her followers, he is subdued by other warriors and submerged in three successive vats of cold water. With CúChulainn so calmed and restored to warrior functionality, Mugain, Conchobor's queen, presents him with tokens of his future role: a blue cloak with a silver clasp and a hooded tunic (*Táin Bó Cúailnge* lines 818–821);[1] and the young warrior takes up a position at the knee of Conchobor, whose warrior he will now be.

11.4 The Italic Warrior

In the Italic reflex of the Indo-European myth of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior, Hercules/Semo Sancus flees to the Aventine grove of Bona Dea in a desperate search for cooling waters that can rob him of the *aestus*, the debilitating heat, fury, and anguish that grips him, along with *ira* 'rage', in the wake of his victory over the tricephal Cacus. The restored hero Hercules then establishes the Ara Maxima, one of the cardinal benchmarks for the perimeter of Romulus's Palatine *pomerium*. The altar, καλεῖται μὲν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων

Μέγιστος 'called by the Romans "the greatest"', is a fixture of ordered society (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 1.40.6 [cf. Diodorus Siculus 4.21.3–4]):

> ἔστι δὲ τῆς Βορίας λεγομένης ἀγορᾶς πλησίον, ἁγιστευόμενος εἰ καί τις ἄλλος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων· ὅρκοι τε γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ καὶ συνθῆκαι τοῖς βουλομένοις βεβαίως τι διαπράττεσθαι καὶ δεκατεύσεις χρημάτων γίνονται συχναὶ κατ' εὐχάς·
>
> It is located in the vicinity of what is called the Forum Boarium, esteemed holier than any other [altar] by natives: for at this [altar] are made oaths and agreements by those wishing to do something resolutely as are many tithe offerings that have been vowed.

The Roman tradition that attributes to the Greek hero Heracles the founding of the Ara Maxima, with the gender polarities in which its cult participates with that of Bona Dea, has been woven into this Italic reflex of the primitive Indo-European myth of the post-combat warrior-in-crisis. Here I repeat my earlier remarks on the process:[2]

> Just as the folktale of Hercules and Cacus is an accretion deposited upon the foundation provided by the ancient Italic myth of Semo Sancus and the three-headed monster that he slays, so Bona Dea certainly has nothing to do with this tale in origin.[3] Her presence here is the consequence of a gender-charged topographical juxtaposition of sacred spaces that both required and provided an interpretative scheme. Women are excluded from worship at Hercules' Ara Maxima; men are excluded from the rites celebrated at Bona Dea's Aventine temple. The two sites effectively bookend the Circus Maximus, the Ara Maxima being directly opposite the open end of the chariot arena and the temple of Bona Dea lying almost due south of the opposite (turning) end . . . . Once Hercules and Cacus were assimilated to Semo Sancus and his three-headed foe, the gravity generated by this opposition of space and gender pulled Bona Dea and her temple spaces inextricably into the tale.

The underlying warrior in crisis is the Italic figure Semo Sancus. As we saw earlier, Propertius concludes his presentation of this tradition with a remarkable reference to Hercules' *becoming* the Sabine Sancus (4.9.73–74):

> *hunc, quoniam manibus purgatum sanxerat orbem*,

sic Sancum Tatiae composuere Cures.
This one, since by his hands he consecrated the orb made pure,
Cures of Tatius thus established as Sancus.

Cures is of course the Sabine city that was linked etymologically with *Quirites* and *Quirinus* that we have encountered several times before (as in §8.7.2.4.2) and to which we shall soon return.

11.4.1 Semo Sancus and Indra

Reminiscent of Indra and his return to the throne of the gods following his restoration, the Italic warrior Semo Sancus, who is restored after the trauma of combat with his own monstrous tricephalic enemy, is said to have been a king deified. Augustine knows this Sancus as the first king of the Sabines, and a figure that the Sabines made a god (*De civ. D*. 18.19):

> *Sabini etiam regem suum primum Sancum sive, ut aliqui appellant, Sanctum, rettulerunt in deos*.
>
> The Sabines likewise assigned to the gods Sancus, their first king, or, as some call him, Sanctus.

Similarly, Lactantius attests the tradition (*Div. inst*. 1.15.8):

> *Privatim vero singuli populi gentis aut urbis suae conditores, seu viri fortitudine insignes erant seu feminae castitate mirabiles, summa veneratione coluerunt, ut Aegyptus Isidem, Mauri Iubam, Macedones Cabirum, Poeni Uraniam, Latini Faunum, Sabini Sancum, Romani Quirinum*, ...
>
> At the same time, individual peoples (*populi*) worshipped with highest veneration the founders of their families or cities, either men who were of conspicuous courage or women of remarkable integrity – thus Egypt worshipped Isis, the Moors Juba, the Macedonians Cabirus, the Carthaginians Urania, the Latins Faunus, the Sabines Sancus, and the Romans Quirinus . . .

Lactantius intimates that in the tradition with which he is familiar, the deification of Semo Sancus, king of Cures, parallels the deification of Romulus, king of Rome, as Quirinus. As discussed earlier (see §§1.4.1; 1.4.2.1.4; 8.7.2.5.1, etc.), this god Quirinus, one of the three chief deities of earliest Rome (i.e., member of the Pre-Capitoline triad), has a theological existence quite apart from any ties to the Roman king

Romulus via apotheosis. If Lactantius's invoked parallelism is meant to suggest that a mortal Sabine hero was, like Romulus, immortalized as the god Semo Sancus, we would suspect here a (euhemeristic) re-appropriation of primitive tradition: this deity Semo Sancus (often identified by the double theonym Semo Sancus Dius Fidius), like the divine Semones generally, of which set he was one member, undoubtedly was rooted in pre-Sabine Indo-European antiquity.[4] Regardless, the structural agreement of the Italic tradition, in the form in which we have it assembled, with the Indic tradition at this point, as at many, is remarkable.

11.4.2 The Second Romulus and the Roman Return to Order

The notion of (re)inauguration is conspicuous in the tradition of Camillus as Second Romulus, as we saw in §6.3.2.4. Camillus has been made the dysfunctional warrior by the action of the *populus Romanus*, consequent to his own warrior atrocity – the warrior languishing in a remote locale in exile. Upon his eventual return to the space of urban Rome from that distant place of retreat, the recovered warrior Camillus finds the space of Rome to be itself a wilderness. Following the omen of the military commander and the standard planted in the Comitium (Livy 5.55.1; Plutarch *Cam.* 32.2), order will be returned to the ruined spaces of Rome. The *lituus* of Romulus is discovered in the shrine of Mars, that cult implement with which Romulus had inaugurated the sacred spaces of earliest Rome – those spaces that will be re-ordered under the auspices of the Second Romulus.

11.5 Roman Ritual

11.5.1 The Sororium Tigillum

This element of the Indo-European myth of the dysfunctional warrior – return of order and inauguration – is particularly conspicuous in the aetiology and rites of the Sororium Tigillum. As right order was once reintroduced by Horatius's submission to the rite of the yoke – to the feminine erotic – following the reprieve he received from the *populus*, so annually on the Kalends of October, as the war-making season comes to an end, the Roman warrior is ritually robbed of the *furor* that would make of him a threat to his own society – that would make of him a dysfunctional warrior – and there is a re-inauguration of domestic, societal order.

11.5.2 The Poplifugia

Such a feature is equally visible in the aetiology of the Poplifugia. In the case of the July 5 flight ritual, the crisis of the warrior is typically depicted as the disappearance of the warrior-king Romulus. As we have just reminded ourselves, Romulus is inaugurated as a deity – Proculus Julius reports to the *populus* that Romulus has been translated into Quirinus, god of the **co-vir-ija*. Moreover, with this "resolution" of the warrior-crisis – the absorption of the warrior-in-crisis by the god of the "third estate" – *order* is subsequently, and unmistakably, introduced into Roman society; following an interregnum, Numa Pompilius, a Sabine – people collectively cast in the role of *la troisième fonction* in the mythic history of Rome by Dumézil's analysis – is chosen to be king (Livy 1.19.1–2):

> *Qui regno ita potitus urbem novam, conditam vi et armis, iure eam legibusque ac moribus de integro condere parat.*
>
> Who, having obtained sovereignty, prepares to found anew, by justice, laws and customs, a city first founded by force and arms.

This Numa, author of Roman order, was not among the Sabines who had settled in Rome during the reign of Romulus; his home was in the Sabine city of *Cures*, a toponym, as we have seen, commonly offered in antiquity as the etymon of Latin *Quirites* and linked with the name of the god *Quirinus*. Numa had chosen, however, to live out his life in quiet contemplation in remote spaces (Plutarch *Numa* 4.1):

> . . . ἐκλείπων τὰς ἐν ἄστει διατριβὰς ἀγραυλεῖν τὰ πολλὰ καὶ πλανᾶσθαι μόνος ἤθελεν, ἐν ἄλσεσι θεῶν καὶ λειμῶσιν ἱεροῖς καὶ τόποις ἐρήμοις ποιούμενος τὴν δίαιταν.
>
> . . . forsaking a city lifestyle he elected to live out in the open most of the time and to wander alone, living his life in groves of the gods and sacred meadows and solitary places.

It was there, in these remote spaces, that Numa cohabited with Egeria – that relationship which we observed Plutarch to characterize as ἀπόρρητος (*Numa* 8.6) – 'forbidden, off-limits' to a sector of society (see §3.3.2). This Egeria is typically identified as a nymph of springs, equated with one of the springs that fed the lake by Diana's sacred grove at Aricia (Strabo 5.3.12; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15.547–551); and she is affiliated with the Camenae, nymphs of that spring that flowed from a cave in a grove outside of the Porta Capena, from which the Vestals drew their daily water supply (Livy 1.21.3), and where,

according to Livy, Numa would go as if to meet with Egeria *sine arbitris* 'without onlookers'.[5]

11.5.3 Romulus, Numa, and the Mythic Matrix

Romulus and Numa are antithetical personalities who together give expression to the full panoply of elements characterizing the primitive Indo-European myth of the dysfunctional warrior. Romulus disappears in a remote space. Ritually that space is recreated by the Comitium and the affiliated Volcanal, a space that is *locus funestus* – *nefas* – (smaller Poplifugium), or by the Campus Martius and the affiliated sanctuary of Vulcan (larger Poplifugium), a space that is denoted as ἀπόρρητος. Numa is that one who emerges out of the remote spaces. He inhabits these spaces with Egeria, a female clairvoyant possessed of great wisdom who is affiliated with a watery medium and with whom Numa is engaged in an ongoing sexual relationship. Their relationship is ἀπόρρητος and *sine arbitris*. With the emergence of Numa, the crisis of the warrior is resolved; order is (re-)established (Romulus is expendable). All of the features of the mythic matrix are present: the annalistic tradition of the events surrounding the transition from Rome's first regency to the second is a transposition into historical narrative of the Indo-European tradition of the warrior-in-crisis and his recovery.[6] Looked at from a slightly different perspective, the aetiology of the Poplifugia/Nonae Caprotinae remains faithful to the Indo-European tradition of the warrior who disappears beyond the boundary, if reworked in keeping with the crafting of the annalistic narrative of the Roman monarchy so as to provide a scenario for the first interregnum and the transition from Rome's violent origins to Numa's peaceful reign.

11.6 Some Conclusions

The feature ORDER AND INAUGURATION is a consistent element of the Indo-European mythic matrix of the post-traumatic warrior. Indra reacquires his position as king of divine society; Batraz and Vahagn are launched on their respective heroic careers, though Batraz's fiery warrior anger will later be turned against Nart society – to be eliminated in a further conflagration of the warrior; CúChulainn takes up his position as Conchobor's preeminent Ulster warrior; Hercules/Semo Sancus is linked to the foundation of the Ara Maxima and the societal order it imparts, and Semo Sancus shows evidence of divine sovereignty; Camillus founds again Rome; Horatius is stripped of the consequences of his warrior atrocity and the rite of the Sororium Tigillum is established; Romulus is subsumed beneath the god of the Curiae, and Cures provides a successor who is no less a second

Romulus than is Camillus.

What commonality can be abstracted from the several synchronic expressions of the matrix feature in the attested descendent traditions? What is the essential ancestral notion that lies at the core of the incorporation of this element in the primitive tradition?

The goal and/or outcome of the recovery of the post-traumatic dysfunctional Indo-European warrior – a restoration engineered by representatives of the realm of fecundity – is not individualistic but societal. The resuscitation of the specialist of force is not effected for the sake of the warrior debilitated by terror and/or rage for his own psychological and physical well-being as an end in itself: the warrior's recovery is requisite for, or otherwise promotes, the well-being of the warrior's society as a whole. The warrior must be robbed of a madness that could bring death to society's members, or reconditioned psychologically so as to render him operative once again within his own realm of specialization. The purpose of the ritual of recovery is to restore order to society – an order in which the warrior fulfills his proper societal role.

[1] In the account of the *Book of Leinster*, the robe is green and the tunic said to be of golden thread (line 1205), where the account of CúChulainn's robing is preceded by a description of his *delba* (see Chapter 8, note 4).

[2] Woodard 2006:217–218; see also p. 211.

[3] Note that the cause of the exclusion of women from the rites of Hercules' great altar is not uniquely bound to this archaic Italic myth of the slaying of the tricephal. Plutarch (*Quaest. Rom.* 60) records a separate tradition, according to which women were not allowed because Carmenta (goddess of the *carmen*, identified with Evander's mother) had arrived late at the inaugural rites (cf. Aurelius Victor, *Origo Gentis Romanae* 6.7). The Bona Dea opposition is a sufficient but not necessary etiological feature of the Ara Maxima's discriminatory rites.

[4] See Woodard 2006:219–224.

[5] An intriguing twist is recorded by Plutarch, who writes (*Numa* 13.1–2) that the spring was created when the *ancile* fell to earth, the archaic shield sent by Jupiter ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῆς πόλεως ‘for the salvation of the city’. This marks the occasion for Numa’s creation of the twelve Salii (Mars’ leaping priests) who carried the original shield and eleven copies as they traveled throughout Rome during the month of March. The duplicates were said to have been forged by Mamurius Veturius; the association of that figure with the shields is most likely secondary to his appearance in the obscure hymn of the Salii. We see here a conjunction of personalities associated with the three flight rituals of Rome: the Salii appear to have played a role in the Regifugium (Festus p. 278M); Mamurius Veturius (Mars’ crazed warrior) is driven from the city at the time of the Mamuralia; and Numa stands as the embodiment of the inauguration of order following the crisis of Romulus’s disappearance, celebrated in the rites of the Poplifugia. On these elements of the Regifugium and the Mamuralia, see Woodard 2011.

[6] On the concept of Roman mythic history and the transposition of inherited Indo-European myth into historical narrative, see Dumézil 1995:1:281–284. See also Woodard 2006:36–38.

12 Further Conclusions and Interpretations

Stock images of Aryan warriors pouring out of the steppes across the European continent and plunging deep into Asia have come to be regarded as insipid, even ignominious, in some quarters. Given the atrocities of the mid-twentieth century with which crude notions of "Aryanism" were enmeshed, such a response is understandable enough.

If, however, one is able to separate mentally and emotionally such latter-day atrocious entanglements from the early Indo-European peoples who provide evidence of the post-traumatic warrior's sufferings, one may perhaps detect a palpable pathos for the warrior and his self-inflicted – that is, societally inflicted – plight. No less so for the still more ancient warrior, nameless and faceless, whose society passed on to its eventual Celtic, Italic, and Indo-Iranian descendants the mythic and ritual traditions of the dysfunctional warrior.

Whatever the numbers of individuals, larger or smaller, involved in population movements out of the Indo-European *Urheimat*, the effectiveness with which the individuals involved in those relocations established themselves linguistically and culturally over vast stretches of Eurasia bespeaks both a willingness to utilize physical force and an efficiency in its application. The scenario would be oft repeated in the military legacy that they perpetuated, if synchronic expressions of the specialist warrior class – *la deuxième fonction – la classe des guerriers* – that appears to have characterized the ancestral Indo-European society would show temporal and local divergences and abandonment. Beyond this ideal segregation of a third part of Proto-Indo-European society for dedicated military function, there is extensive evidence, cultural and linguistic, provided by various descendent Indo-European peoples for the existence of smaller, tightly knit warrior subsets – so-called *Männerbünde* – characterizing primitive Indo-European society: cohorts of young men banded into fraternal warrior units who symbolically associated themselves with wolves and bears and who, practicing a feral combat style, such as that typically associated with the Norse *berserkir*, may have provided an elite force for battle.[1] One could hardly underestimate the immediacy and vividness of the

carnage inflicted, experienced, and witnessed by the primitive Indo-European warrior, fighting at close quarters with weapons of stone, and then metal, designed to puncture and rend soft tissue and to crush living bone, while equipped with little in the way of protective armor aside from shields of hide and wood.

In remote Indo-European antiquity, no less than in the present day, profound psychological reaction to such horrors was certainly a well-known phenomenon – an inevitable expression of some deep-seated violation of fundamental elements of the evolved mind of the human animal colliding with perceptions of societal expectations of the warrior's proper function for the good of the whole, and at the same time squared against realizations of personal mortality. The Indo-European warrior's post-traumatic response to combat at times expressed itself as withdrawal and isolation, at times as unabated rage turned homeward – passive and aggressive reactions to the same event – warrior responses personified in the Indo-European myth of the dysfunctional warrior as the "Indra-type" and "CúChulainn-type," respectively. The typologies merge in the case of the "Semo Sancus-type." Regardless of the *type*, the warrior-in-crisis leaves society at risk: the dedicated specialist in the use of physical force – member of *la deuxième fonction* – has ceased to function.

A means of restoring the dysfunctional warrior to functionality was required for the preservation of the security of society and the structure of society. The restorative mechanism that is revealed in the myth and ritual of the dysfunctional warrior, with its matrix of features, must surely be one that took shape piece by piece, by trial and error, over a long time, assembled from components of yet more primitive practices and concepts: even so, the assembled structure revealed by the evidence of the descendent Indo-European cultures may well antedate the attested expressions of the tradition by millennia. Society devised a ritual procedure for returning the dysfunctional post-traumatic warrior to his proper role. Was the procedure in some sense therapeutic? Presumably society judged it to be sufficiently so to get the warrior back into action and to channel his warrior madness away from society and toward the enemy, at least temporarily. But then who is the intended principal beneficiary of the therapeutic procedure? Society.

Repeated here is the set of matrix features characterizing the myth and ritual of the dysfunctional warrior that was identified and explored in the preceding chapters:

1) CRISIS OF THE WARRIOR

2) FLIGHT AND A DISTANT LOCALE
3) FEMININE EROTICISM
4) CLAIRVOYANT WOMAN
5) APPLICATION OF WATERS
6) ORDER AND INAUGURATION

The CRISIS OF THE WARRIOR is the warrior's post-traumatic dysfunctionality: the featural denotation is ambiguous. There is a crisis that engulfs the warrior as a consequence of his combat experience. One can thus interpret the possessive phrase "of the warrior" as being of that sort that grammarians call an *objective genitive*: the warrior is object of the crisis – the warrior shows the well-documented symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder. More fundamentally, however, as we have discovered, within primitive Indo-European tradition, the possessive phrase is a subjective genitive: the warrior is subject of the crisis – a crisis experienced by a society that needs, for its perceived continued preservation, to return the warrior to combat ability.

The feature FLIGHT AND A DISTANT LOCALE is a set piece within the Indic, Celtic, and Italic (i.e., the most fully preserved) reflexes of the Indo-European mythic tradition of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior; and we have seen expressions of it elsewhere. One could imagine that the feature simply replicates the actual post-combat experience of the traumatized warrior: a physical retreat into a place of isolation, or an accelerated return to the warrior's society while the warrior remains in a state of battle madness. Yes – of course, this must be so. But, aside from the consideration that episodic expressions of isolationism and rage associated with post-traumatic stress syndrome are not restricted to relocation events in the immediate aftermath of combat, there is more to the Indo-European tradition than the mechanical transference of the warrior from the battlefield to some other locale: the idealized myths of the post-combat movements of the dysfunctional warrior were certainly wed to ritual acts that mirrored and addressed the warrior's experience. We have noted two points in the preceding discussions that are of particular significance in this regard: (1) boundaries are crucially demarcated in the several mythic traditions of the dysfunctional warrior; and (2) the "flights" of the mythic and ritual traditions entail movements not only of the traumatized warrior but of larger elements of society as well.

Comparative Indic and Italic evidence has previously revealed that primitive Indo-European rites were conducted within temporarily constructed contiguous smaller and larger cult spaces crucially

delimited by sacred boundaries, rites that in part rehearsed geographical movements of Indo-Europeans into new localities. Priests and worshippers ambulate ("journey," as it were) into and around these spaces.[2] The distal bounding line of the larger ritual space in effect represents an "unboundary" – symbolizing the perpetual nature of envisioned expansion, a process bringing to the worshipper material blessings and access to the gods.[3] One would suspect that primitive Indo-European rituals of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior, with their associated myths, were played out in just such bounded sacred spaces. Within such spaces there must have occurred ritual movements of not only the warrior – the warrior whose trauma drives him across boundary and bounded space in the affiliated mythic traditions – but movements of other elements of society who seek out the warrior and take the necessary measures to restore him to functionality – for the sake of society. The myths may be read to suggest that the restorative ritual acts involving ambulation of other members of society, likely occurred from the smaller sacred space into the larger, and/or otherwise across a sacred boundary of the utilized cult space. Again, this would be consistent with what can be otherwise observed of Indo-European rites conducted within such sacred space.

Primitive Indo-European rituals of this sort would be the antecedents of the Roman rites aimed at robbing the warrior of his *furor* – those of the Sororium Tigillum and the associated *iugum* 'yoke'. Possibly such an ancestral ritual event also lies behind the Vedic purification doctrine associated with the three Āptyas (see *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.2.3.1–5), of whom the 'third', Trita, was implicated in the slaying of the tricephal, the "crime" bound to Indra's flight into his remote space of hiding (see §§ 8.4.1.2.2 and 8.7.2). The Āptyas are said to wipe away the stain of sacrifice, an action grounded in and generalized from the removal of the stain of murder from Indra – the stain of his act of brahmanicide that the poets couple with the slaying of Vṛtra. Dumézil draws attention to the treatment of the doctrine that appears at *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* 4.1.9:[4]

> . . . there is a specification in this text as to the nature of the "sacrificial stain" which the Āptya wipe away: it is the bloodshed, "the bloody [*krūra*] part or aspect" of the sacrifice.

The Sanskrit adjective *krūra-*, here translated as 'bloody', also has the fundamental meaning 'wounded', and used substantivally can carry the sense 'wound', 'cruelty', or 'slaughter', as in *Atharva Veda* 12.5.14, where the Brahmin's cow that is stolen by the warrior

(*kṣatriya*) is said to hold, among other curses, "all the slaughters (*krūrāṇi*) of humankind." Sanskrit *krūra-*, cognate with Avestan *xrūra-* 'bloody', Latin *crudus* 'raw' (also 'savage'), and so on, stems from Proto-Indo-European *kreuh$_2$- 'raw flesh', etymon also of the Sanskrit noun *kraviṣ-* 'raw flesh, carrion', Middle Irish *crú* 'blood', Latin *cruor* 'blood, gore, slaughter'.

Such primitive Indo-European ritual orchestration does not, however, obviate the likelihood that the measures devised for dealing with the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior were at times used as an immediate, that is, "emergency," response to combat trauma. Indeed, it must be in such moments that we have to look for the very inception of the methods. More than that, as we are about to see, there is an apparent historical record of the Celtic employment of such a procedure in a moment of combat crisis.

The feature labeled FEMININE EROTICISM appears to be central to the myth and ritual of the post-traumatic warrior. It is a particular expression of the power of *la troisième fonction* over *la deuxième*, of the specialists in fertility and sensuality over the specialists in physical might – an expression of a certain idealized balance within society whereby the masses, whose lot it is to produce the goods that nourish and sustain society, negate a dysfunctionality that could destroy society, or some part of it. Fundamentally it is only an extension of the role otherwise played by the "third estate."

The restoration of the Indo-European warrior at the hands of representatives of the realm of fertility is not unique to the myth and ritual of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior. The same motif is well-attested in other traditions about weakened warriors that show themselves in India and in Rome. Indra, the warrior deity *par excellence*, made a pact of non-aggression with his former enemy, Namuci; that demon could thus be described as *indrasya sakhā* 'a friend of Indra' according to Mahīdhara in his commentary on *Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā* 10.34 (cf. *Mahābhārata* 9.43.33). But Namuci, utilizing the liquor *surā*, robbed Indra of his *indriyam* 'might', his *vīryam* 'virility', and other advantages (see *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 12.7.1.10–12).[5] Indra will only recover his lost physical powers when three preeminent members of the divine *classe des cultivateurs* come to his aid: the twin gods of this set, the Aśvins, and the goddess Sarasvatī. The three deities, who are described as providing a cure, reveal to Indra the means by which he may destroy Namuci without violating the letter of the truce that binds the enfeebled warrior and his now "befriended" enemy (see also, *inter alia*, *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 12.7.3.1; *Rig Veda* 10.131.4–5): Indra "churns" off the head of Namuci at dawn with the foam of a wave.

Dumézil realized that this Indic tradition of the weakened warrior rescued by three representatives of *la troisième fonction* is of primitive Indo-European origin, indentifying a homologous expression of the tradition in Rome.[6] Following upon Horatius's defeat of the triplet warriors from Alba Longa (see §8.7.2), the Alban dictator Mettius Fuffetius was compelled, by prior agreement (*foedus*), to provide military aid to Tullus Hostilius in a Roman war against Fidenae and Veii: it is a conflict that had been secretly instigated by Mettius himself, while he pretended to be *socius* 'comrade, ally' (Sanskrit *sakhā-* [as *indrasya sakhā* 'a friend of Indra']; cf. Old English *secg* 'follower'; Greek ἀοσσέω 'I help', etc.) of the Roman king (Livy 1.27.2–3). In the historicized Roman homologue of this Indo-European tradition, the weakening of the warrior (Tullus) that is effected by the "befriended" enemy (Mettius) takes the form of a treacherous withdrawal of the Alban contingent from the battlefield, exposing the flank of the Roman army. Livy (1.27.7) records that in this moment of impending disaster, Tullus vows priests – Salii – to the god Quirinus,[7] divine personification of *la classe des cultivateurs* in the Pre-Capitoline triad (see §5.3.1); Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 3.32.4) reports that Tullus vows not only Salii to Quirinus but festivals to the agrarian goddess Ops and god Saturnus, though the Greek historian has transferred the vows to the occasion of the ensuing combat with the Sabines ("apparently for reasons of literary balance"[8]). The Roman army is saved: three deities from the realm of fertility are again crucially involved in the restoration of the weakened warrior.[9]

While the realm of fertility generally and expressions of feminine eroticism specifically are well-attested in the Roman rites of the July 5 and July 7, as we have observed (slave-women engaged in scandalous talk with the men whom they meet; women taking part in cat fights, etc.) there is no overt expression of feminine nudity, of lewd displays of the feminine body, of the sort that we encounter in the Irish tradition of CúChulainn and in the Italic tradition of Hercules/Semo Sancus. Were such nude displays actually a component of Indo-European ritual designed to rob the dysfunctional warrior of his combat madness and restore him to functionality, or do they figure only in mythic tradition?

Cross culturally, ritual nudity is not an uncommon phenomenon: Fraser's *Golden Bough*, for instance, is replete with examples. On the one hand, there certainly appears to be no reason to eliminate *a priori* the possibility of such a practice among Proto-Indo-Europeans. On the other side of it, there is clear evidence preserved of proto-historical and historical Indo-Europeans observing ritual nudity or practices consistent with the picture of ritual nudity that has emerged from our

study of the myth and rites of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior. The most immediately revealing evidence concerns the Celts, both Continental and Insular.

In his *Bellum Gallicum* (7.47), Julius Caesar relates an incident that occurred during the fight against the Celtic forces of Vercingetorix for Gergovia (in central France) in 52 BC, a fight that Caesar lost. As an element of the Roman army closed on the town, women – Caesar identifies them as *matres familiae* 'married women' – appeared on the city wall, hurling down *vestem argentumque* 'clothing and silver'; what happens next can be reasonably construed *within the narrative* as the natural outcome of that action: *et pectore nudo prominentes passis manibus obtestabantur Romanos* 'and leaning forward with naked breasts they were imploring the Romans' – imploring them, writes Caesar, not to repeat the slaughter of women and children that the Romans had perpetrated at the siege of Avaricum. Some of the women were even lowered from the walls, he continues, and *sese militibus tradebant* 'they handed themselves over to the soldiers'. The din from the Roman advance against the walls, however, brought Gallic reinforcements (7.48); and with the Romans on the verge of retreat, the same women were soon imploring (*obtestor*) their own men and derisively displaying disheveled hair to the Romans *more Gallico* 'in Gallic fashion'.

In 1928, Joseph Vendryes examined Caesar's passage in the context of the Irish accounts of CúChulainn's confrontations with nude females. The French Celticist concludes that: "Il est probable que César lui-même s'est mépris sur le geste des femmes gauloises."[10] Vendryes is almost certainly correct in that judgment – Caesar did not understand the significance of what he was recording; but Vendryes somewhat mischaracterizes the nature of the parade of bared breasts extending over the city wall when he continues: "Il n'a compris qu'elle accomplissaient un geste rituel de caractère propitiatoire." The Gallic women were engaging in ritual performance – but it is not a *propitiatory* ritual.[11] In a moment of crisis – in an emergency setting – these women of Gergovia were employing the primitive Indo-European rite of actively *repulsing* the warrior, of exerting the power of the realm of fertility over that of physical power, a component of the process of overwhelming the threatening warrior's *furor* – and seemingly with some success (the Roman soldiers, after all, were presumably unaware of the danger of the women's gaze).[12]

Mention should also be made of a report that Pliny (*HN* 22.2) offers regarding ritual female nudity among Celtic peoples. He writes of a material in Gaul used for body-painting, *glastum*, which he identifies as a plant material similar to *plantago* ('plantain').[13] Pliny reports that

Britannorum coniuges nurusque ‘the wives and young women of the Britons’ color their entire bodies with this material and that so stained they process nude *quibusdam in sacris* ‘in certain sacred rites’.

Though their nature and origin are a matter of ongoing debate (and so have fueled much speculation), relevant here may be those peculiar Medieval carved figures of nude females found across Ireland, but also known from England, Wales and Scotland,[14] commonly called *Sheela-na-gigs*, many preserved in churches. The meaning of the term is uncertain, but interestingly was attested as the name of a dance prior to its attested use for the carved figure.[15] The carvings typically depict a nude woman in a conspicuously lewd pose, with legs apart and vagina exposed, sometimes spread open by one or both hands.[16]

The full-frontal gaze of the *Sheela-na-gig* is nearly as arresting as the exposed genitalia, and the positioning of the figure frequently sets face and vagina as polar points along the vertical axis, pronounced extremities that at times seem intended to balance out. The conspicuousness of head and vagina has of course not gone unnoticed; Freitag, for example, writes: “The greatest value was obviously attached to the head and the genital area because these two parts are strongly modeled and represented disproportionately large compared to the rest of the figure.”[17] Regarding the eyes and the intensity of their gaze, Freitag observes:[18]

> The eyes are invariably large and clearly demarcated. Occasionally they simply consist of two cavities. In the majority of cases the upper and lower eyelids are joined to form an oval. Many eyes have an owl-like quality, seemingly glaring or staring, and thus creating a strong visual impact which is frequently further enhanced by asymmetry. The carver of Shanrahan . . . highlighted the eyes by giving them a grayish-white colour in contrast to the red sandstone out of which the rest of the figure is made. Two quite dissimilar eyes can be seen in Ballynacarriga . . . , where the right eye is circular and much larger than the left, which is oval. The Tullaroan Sheela . . . also has a much larger right eye and the difference between the two eyes is further accentuated in that the left eye is surrounded by a circle of tiny incisions, almost like a monocle, and by the fact that it has a small punctured hole in the middle. In the case of Newton Lennan . . . the only difference between the two eyes is size, the right one again being considerably bigger. In Moate . . . the right eye appears to have an eyeball, whereas the left one looks empty.

Sheela-na-gigs are commonly described as “apotropaic,” and if such a characterization accurately captures their essence, then, as Ford advocates, their function of ‘turning away’ is consistent with CúChulainn’s response to feminine nudity in the earlier-rehearsed episodes from the *Táin*.[19] Ford’s observation is made as he considers the figures in regard to “boundary,” his chief concern being with notions of the obscene and with the violation of cultural boundaries. He situates this treatment, however, within a broader context of boundary in early Irish society:[20]

> The basic sociopolitical unit is the *túath*, which occupies a clearly defined territory, marked by a river, ditch, dike, or other natural and man-made boundaries. In the cultural tradition represented in early Irish literature, the boundaries are jealously guarded by warriors, so that none may enter the territory save poets.

The association is an interesting one given the prominence of “boundary” in the myths and rituals of the Indo-European post-traumatic warrior and the fundamental significance of boundaries in Indo-European ritual observances conducted within designated sacred space; though it is unclear if in these mythic traditions female nudity in and of itself is an expression of boundary-violation – as it is held to be in Ford’s treatment:[21]

> Female nudity, particularly the female genitals, are an obscenity in that they represent the portals to the beyond, the other side of the cultural boundaries within which the hero’s differentiated life has meaning. Beyond those boundaries is loss of self, continuity rather than discontinuity, undifferentiated existence, death.

The operative feature in the Indo-European tradition of restoring the raging dysfunctional warrior is certainly one that is thousands of years older than earliest-attested Irish society and one that fundamentally entails a perceived danger to the warrior in joining a *reciprocal gaze* with the erotic feminine. As one ponders the feature one is left with the sense of being in the presence of a biological and psychological primitive of great time depth that finds expression in Indo-European society in the mores – or, more likely, taboos – of *la classe des guerriers*. And this is a feature that may well be encoded in the iconography of the *Sheela-na-gig*, whatever Medieval synchronic interpretation may have been applied to the image.

The practice of ritual nudity is likewise attested in ancient India.[22] In the *Kauśika Sūtra* (38.4), a rite is described for calming a storm

that prescribes nudity: “One has to walk against the storm, naked, sword, fire-brand or club in hand”[23]; the rite is performed while chanting *Atharva Veda* 1.12, a prayer to lightning to drive away fever.[24] The conjunction of nudity and the relief of feverishness is of course one central to the Indo-European myth of the post-traumatic warrior. Gonda calls attention to *Vārāha Gṛhya Puruṣa* 10.10, which describes a rite of expiation “required because of grievous mistakes”: the ritual includes nude observance and fire walking.[25]

In addition to such rites, there are various restrictions regarding nudity that find expression in the Indic legal texts – restrictions worth mentioning in the context of the present investigation. *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* (‘Laws of Manu’) 4.44 is of particular interest as it concerns *tejas*, that ‘fiery energy, vital power’ discussed in §8.4.1.1 that Nahuṣa steals from seers, gods, and others with his gaze – Nahuṣa the stand-in for the dysfunctional Indra, that one called *ghorarūpa* and *ghoradarśana* ‘having a horrible appearance’, *ghoradṛṣṭi* ‘having a horrible gaze’, and so on, that one lusting after Śacī, the erotic feminine. According to *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* 4.44, the ‘Brahmin desiring *tejas*’ must not look at woman while she is naked (cf. 4.53).[26] At *Gautama Dharmaśāstra* 9.48 we read that a Brahmin and a *snātaka* must not look at another man’s wife naked: a *snātaka* is a student who has taken part in his “final bath” – that is, has completed his studies; the instructions in *Gautama Dharmaśāstra* 9 seemingly[27] are given as requirements for both the *snātaka*, who is a Brahmin, and that one who is a member of the Kṣatriya (warrior) class. According to *Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra* 3.9.6, a *snātaka* must not look at a nude woman except when he is having intercourse with her. Gonda reports that *Atharva Veda Pariśiṣṭa* 1.3.25 states that “the sight of a naked . . . person is a bad omen that should prevent a king from setting forth on a military expedition.”[28]

To return to the question set out earlier – “Were displays of feminine nudity actually a component of Indo-European ritual designed to rob the dysfunctional warrior of his combat madness and restore him to functionality, or do they figure only in mythic tradition?”: in light of the evidence provided by both Continental and Insular Celts and Indo-Aryans, one can at least say that the occurrence of prior Indo-European ritual nudity is a likely prospect. Given that, and given the conspicuous presence of female nudity in the expression of the feature FEMININE EROTICISM in the Celtic and Italic mythic traditions of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior, the participation of nude females in rites designed to restore functionality to the warrior is reasonably likely.

In Chapter 8 we saw a tendency to amalgamate the feminine and the fire in the Indic – in fact, Indo-Iranian – tradition of the recovery of the post-traumatic warrior: Agni alternates with Upaśruti/Śacī in the discovery of Indra, and so on. In Chapter 9 I proposed that the Roman aetiology of the ritual complex of July 5 and July 7 attests a similar amalgamation of fire and feminine as revelatory agents, and hence that "a common inheritance of Indo-European tradition is suggested." At the same time, there is evidence of a variant structuring in which the feminine is kept distinct from fire, attested at both eastern and western extremities of the Indo-European expansion area – Indic and Italic. Is there any resolution of this primitive variance to be found?

As the Vedic rites are celebrated that entail movement from the smaller into the larger sacred space, rites that replicate and effectuate the expansion into new territory, the sacrificer and priests are accompanied in this journey by warrior deities, Indra and Viṣṇu.[29] Also present is the Fire god, Agni, leading the way (*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 3.6.3.11–12; *Tattirīya Saṃhitā* 1.3.4.c).[30] The Indo-European demarcated ritual spaces that antedate the Vedic (and Roman) smaller and larger sacred spaces in which this ritual journey is acted out, I suggested earlier, may conceivably have provided the spaces for the rites conducted for the restoration of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior, with their affiliated myths in which space and boundary are crucially significant. Fire – Agni – Vulcan – are also conspicuously present in those traditions. The guiding Fire of the Vedic ritual journey into bounded sacred space and the guiding Fire of Indic mythic tradition who crosses into remote space, beyond the boundary, seeking out the warrior in retreat, Indra – and thus the warrior who can no longer accompany society in its onward march into new reaches – are one and the same guide, Agni.

To see the potential significance of this for the parent Indo-European tradition one must bear in mind the dual response to combat trauma that the warrior displays – both as attested in Indo-European tradition and as otherwise well known: isolation from the warrior's society, on the one hand, and rage directed inward against the warrior's society, on the other – two variant though – and this is important – not mutually exclusive expressions of dysfunctionality in response to the same traumatic phenomenon of combat. Each expression may well have had its own separate ritual response: the one dedicated to seeking out the warrior who has isolated himself from society and performing the proper rites required to reintegrate him into society, the other dedicated to confronting the warrior unable to relinquish his battle rage.

Agni's role as the guiding Fire could reasonably be viewed as suggesting that in primitive Indo-European mythic tradition, it is the role of Fire to seek out the post-traumatic warrior in isolation – the warrior who has withdrawn from society, the dysfunctional warrior who has fled beyond the boundary to a place that is, from society's perspective, off-limits. In the affiliated ritual observance, a procession led by Fire would pass beyond a designated sacred boundary. Just so, in the Roman reflex of this ancestral ritual, the Roman *populus* "runs with fire," I have suggested, to the Volcanal and affiliated space of the Comitium, beyond the sacred boundary of the Palatine *pomerium*, in the archaic celebration of the smaller Poplifugium, in the midst of the crisis of the disappearing warrior.

On the other hand, it is through the agency of the erotic feminine that primitive Indo-European society would address the problem of the post-traumatic warrior who is possessed by unabating combat rage. The Roman rite of the Sororium Tigillum on the Kalends of October preserves the stratagem well. It is taboo for the Indo-European warrior to allow his gaze to fall upon the gazing erotic feminine – the almost certainly nude feminine in the ancestral ritual tradition. There is danger to the warrior in that gaze – the warning of Bona Dea's old sorceress to Semo Sancus and the fate of Nahuṣa clearly show it. The warrior must turn aside his gaze from the object that would otherwise naturally draw him. The responses of CúChulainn (whose sexual exploits are well attested) to the women of Ulster and Riches who engage him in his battle fury make it plain: the exposed breast becomes the foe. Temporarily disabled by the gazing erotic feminine, the warrior is subdued. Is this only one of some set of taboos by which the Indo-European warrior was constrained? One is reminded both of the *gessa* of the Irish warrior (see §7.3) and of the numerous behavioral constraints shared by the Indic Brahmin and the Roman Flamen Dialis (some of which concern nudity) that point to a common set of Indo-European priestly taboos.[31]

Closely affiliated with the erotic feminine in the disarming of the warrior is the accompanying CLAIRVOYANT WOMAN. She is a "sorceress" or, given the proposed cult setting for the restoration of the dysfunctional warrior, one likely better identified as a sacerdotal figure, whose role is to guide the congregation of nude women in their ritual confrontation with the post-traumatic warrior, perhaps to warn him of the danger that the reciprocal gaze holds for him – a ritual facilitator who can transcend the relevant boundaries. Her alignment with the erotic feminine is sufficiently close that she herself can be assimilated to that element in myth, as we have seen in the descendent Indo-Iranian traditions and in the Roman aetiology of the

ritual complex of July 5 and July 7.

It is not difficult to envision how in such a ritual scenario the two operatives crucially consecrated to the recovery of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior – the Fire (that accompanies the ritual participants) and the erotic feminine – one dedicated to seeking out the warrior in isolation, one dedicated to disarming the raging warrior – potentially the same warrior – could functionally merge through diachronic progressions. As the ritual and affiliated myths evolve and are continuously subjected to synchronic reinterpretation, fire and the feminine collide. This process must have been exacerbated by a conceptualization of the rage of the warrior as a fire itself – a natural metaphorical expression of a destructive psychological state – in conjunction with a further element of the ancestral rites designed to relieve the warrior of his dysfunctionality, an immersion of the warrior into cold water – a remedy utilizing the very substance that overwhelms fire. We should bear in mind that the envisioned process may be a deeply ancient one, with the crucial assimilations and reinterpretations at work already during a common Indo-European period.

With regard to such a rite of immersion in the restoration of the primitive Indo-European post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior, we should note that the phenomenon of the ceremonial bath is well attested in ancient India (and daily ablutions are an essential aspect of the modern Hindu faith); and indeed the practice of ritual ablutions of one sort or another is common across religious traditions. Reference was made earlier to the "final bath" – the final ceremonial ablution – of the student Brahmin: the *snātaka* is the one 'having bathed', from the verb root *snā-* 'to bathe, perform the ablution ceremony'. The conclusion of the various forms of the Vedic Soma sacrifice,[32] ceremonies entailing ritual "journey" between the small and the great sacred spaces as described earlier, are marked by the ritual bath called the Avabhṛtha: accompanied by priests, the sacrificer and his wife walk beyond the northern boundary of the great sacred space to a water source into which the implements used in the performance of the ritual are thrown to be washed, and into which the sacrificer and his wife descend for ablutions (see *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 4.4.5.1–23). It is again a matter of the one immersed's being dispossessed of some acquired essence. Of the Avabhṛtha, Keith writes that this act of bathing:[33]

> . . . concerns itself with the removal of the mysterious potency, which has clung since the Dīkṣā to the sacrificer and his wife, rendering them unfit for normal human life. That this was

realized by the priest is clearly proved by the language used of the rite:[34] the waters are distinctly said to remove the consecration and the Tapas, and it is stated that the sacrificer takes the consecration with him into the bath.

The Dīkṣā is the ascetic rite of consecration of the sacrificer that takes place at the outset of a Soma sacrifice. By his asceticism the sacrificer acquires *tapas*, a term literally meaning 'heat'[35] (from the root of *tapati* 'to warm, burn'). Compare the Sanskrit term's various Indo-European congeners such as Latin *tepor* 'warmth, fevered state'; Umbrian *tefra* 'burnt offerings'; probably Hittite *tapišša-* and Luvian *tapašša-* 'fever'; and, perhaps significantly, and surely intriguingly, Old Irish *tess* 'heat' – the word used to reference the 'heat' that was released from within the raging CúChulainn and so warmed the cold water vats in which he was immersed (*Táin Bó Cúailnge*, Recension I, lines 815–818):

Maitti immi-seom in dabach hísin. In dabach aile dano in ro lád, fichis dornaib de. In tress dabach i ndeochaid iar sudiu, fosngert-side combo chuimsi dó a tess 7 a fuacht.

This vat burst around him. The second tub into which he was thrown boiled with fist-size bubbles from that. The third vat into which he went afterward, he heated it so that its heat and its coldness were suitable for him.

Tapas is the potential energy often associated with ascetic Brahmins, who by their practice of austerities acquire *tapas*; when unleashed, it is a power that can bring harm even to the gods – and is indeed sometimes used recklessly and destructively by a Brahmin in a moment of rage. According to *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* 3.6.2, by this ritual bath, the Avabhṛtha, the sacrificer "takes the Dīkṣā back into the water." In the verses chanted by the priest at the time of the Avabhṛtha, the water is said to remove the Dīkṣā and *tapas* (*Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra* 13.21.3).

In *Rig Veda* 10.167.1 we read that Indra won heaven by his *tapas*. Nahuṣa, the stand-in for the dysfunctional Indra, pled that he lacked the *balam* 'force' and *śakti* 'power' to be king, but the gods and seers who attempt to persuade him to take Indra's throne declare that he shall govern by their *tapas* (*Mahābhārata* 5.11.4–5). By an increase of *tejas*[36] and *tapas* (5.16.24) Nahuṣa thus acquires the gaze that is *tejohara* '*tejas*-stealing', that one characterized as *dṛṣṭiviṣa* 'poison gaze' and *sughora* 'truly horrible' (5.16.26), that gaze that will be his

undoing.

A recurring motif is the loss of a Brahmin's pent-up *tapas* through sexual intercourse. A well-known example appears in Book One of the *Mahābhārata*, the case of Viśvāmitra, to whom a fearful Indra sent the Apsarā Menakā to seduce and rob him of his threatening *tapas* (1.65–66). The erotic feminine is again crucially involved in removing one of a potentially destructive inner ardor.

Earlier in this chapter we examined the Indo-European tradition of the weakened warrior who recovers through the intervention of deities of the realm of fertility and goods production. Indra was robbed of his *indriyam* 'might', *vīryam* 'virility', and so forth by the treachery of Namuci. With the assistance of the Aśvins and Sarasvatī, Indra is able to escape from the agreement that binds him to Namuci, to decapitate that *sakhā* 'friend', and so to regain his lost power. In Book Nine of the *Mahābhārata* (the *Śalyaparvan*), the poets relate how the severed head of Namuci then dogged Indra, howling *Bho! Bho! Mitrahan pāpeti* 'You! You! Evil friend-slayer' (9.43.35). To be purified, and so rid himself of this ever-present specter of the carnage he had inflicted on the unsuspecting *indrasya sakhā*, Indra takes part in a ritual of ablution, as directed by Brahma (9.43.37–43). Indra is told to perform a sacrifice at the river Arunā and to bathe ceremonially in its waters at the *tirtha* 'ford' (place of pilgrimage). Brahma announces that Sarasvatī (who is both goddess and river) flooded the Arunā – a sacred conjunction of waters – and tells Indra that by bathing there *sughorāt tvaṃ pātakād . . . mokṣyase* 'you will be released from the truly horrible sin'. Performing the sacrifice *Sarasvatyāḥ kuñje*'at the bower of Sarasvatī' and the ablution rites, Indra is thus freed from the crime and is able to return to heaven, and the severed head of Namuci – that phantasm that haunted the warrior Indra – plunges into the ceremonial waters: the warrior's mania is washed away. We again encounter in the restoration of the warrior the crucial presence of the feature APPLICATION OF WATERS.

Did the waters of ritual bath – the ablutions – of the post-traumatic Indo-European warrior wash away the warrior's mania? Did they release the warrior from his dysfunctional psyche? In other words, to ask again the question with which this chapter began, was the primitive Indo-European procedure for restoring the post-traumatic warrior in any sense what we would call "therapeutic"?

To judge by the recovery of the dysfunctional Indra, who hid in a remote space beyond society's borders following his combat with Vṛtra, the seeking out of the warrior in isolation, with Fire guiding the way, is a process of society's actively reincorporating the warrior within its domain. Society sends a delegation to the liminal space of

the warrior's isolation to sing his praise, to hymn the warrior into recovery. So hymned, the withdrawn, diminished Indra once again grows strong. The poets of the *Mahābhārata* preserve evidence of a process that is designed in effect to reassure the warrior of his prowess – of a discourse of recovery and restoration. This we might judge to be a form of "therapy."

But even in the accounts of the warrior in isolation – the warrior who has abandoned functionality by self-removal to a distant place – the medium of water is still pronounced. Immersion in waters, ablution, is not unique to the account of the warrior whose dysfunctionality is unabated battle rage, the warrior whose restoration follows upon a confrontation with the erotic feminine. Nor should this come as any surprise, for, as already pointed out, and as is tragically otherwise obvious, both symptoms of the sufferings of the post-traumatic warrior, isolation and rage, can and do go hand-in-hand, inflicting one and the same warrior.

In what sense can the rite of ablution conducted for the post-traumatic warrior be said to be therapeutic? The rite must be intended to rob the warrior of a temporary, acquired trait, one that provides the power and means by which he survives and vanquishes society's enemies on the field of battle – but one not intended to be a permanent possession. As the concluding Avabhṛtha robs the Soma sacrificer and his wife of *tapas*, that "mysterious potency . . . rendering them unfit for normal human life," as Keith phrases it, as vats of cold water relieve CúChulainn of his *ferg* and Batraz of his consuming inner fire, as the spring of Bona Dea's sacred grove takes away the *ira* and *aestus* of Semo Sancus, so the ablutions of the post-traumatic warrior are meant to rid him of that "potency" that makes him societally dysfunctional. It is a metaphysical alteration that is envisioned, but one with concrete consequences for society – one intended to ensure society's well-being.

But is it therapeutic? It is in some sense therapeutic for society – to the extent that society is reassured in the belief it has undertaken the proper measures to rid the warrior in its presence of a "mysterious potency" that is potentially destructive to society. But can such a procedure save society? Does it "work"? Presumably so, normatively so, one could imagine, so long as the warrior himself were to embrace, at some appropriate level of his being, the efficacy of the procedure – if he were "willing" to play out his role in the sacred drama and so submit himself to the power of ritual expectations and cultural mores.

But does the procedure produce a psychological alteration – a kind of self-hypnosis perhaps – relieving the warrior of the trauma that generates his fiery rage, as the waters of the Arunā washed away the

demon that relentlessly tormented the warrior Indra? That is a far more difficult question to address from the vantage point of Western modernity. But from a primitive Indo-European perspective, it would seem that it hardly matters – as long as the warrior can get back to the fight – as long as he can once again generate the frenzy that will allow him to bring carnage to the enemy and so perform yet again his proper function in society – the function of *la classe des guerriers – la deuxième fonction*. The idealized restoration that recovery brings in the Indo-European myth of the post-traumatic warrior is a return of order to society.

What remains of these rites in historical Rome finds one expression in the Poplifugia. The ritual complex of July 5 and July 7 is an annual commemoration of the dysfunctional warrior, but one observed from the perspective of society, of the *populus Romanus*: a celebration of the power of the masses in the moment of the warrior's crisis, and not a sympathetic expression of the warrior's plight. In earliest Rome, I have argued, the rites are held on July 5 in the vicinity of the Volcanal and the associated Comitium, that most sacred space of most archaic Rome. The primitive Indo-European motif of the traumatic disappearance of the post-combat warrior is recast as the disappearance of the warrior-king Romulus, one cut short in his war-making career, one who ceases to perform his proper function by the crisis of his disappearance. As a delegation of society under the guidance of Fire (Agni) seeks out the warrior-king Indra in his remote place of disappearance, so Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ μετὰ πυρὸς ἔδραμον 'the Romans ran with fire' – that is, in the accompaniment of Fire (Vulcan) – as the *populus Romanus* makes its way from the proximal sacred space (from the perspective of the Roman *urbs*) across the *pomerium* into the remote sacred space (that of the Comitium) of Romulus's disappearance. While the diminutive Indra who has vanished within the waters is raised up to his former stature by the enunciative act of Bṛhaspati, priestly leader of the delegation, the vanished Romulus is raised up to the heavens and assimilated into Quirinus, god of the masses, who seek the dysfunctional warrior, and who are apprised of that subsumption, and calmed, by the enunciation of Αἴλιος Πρᾶος (the 'soothing Aelius'? [that is, from Greek πρᾶος 'gentle, mild, taming']).

The textual evidence that survives incorporates no direct reference to warrior-ablution rites as constituting a component of the ritual assemblage of the Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae. This should likely come as no surprise: the rites as we know them have been refocused to accentuate the role of the realm of fecundity in the response to the crisis of the warrior who has disappeared in remote space – to celebrate the power of *la classe des cultivateurs* over the *la classe des*

guerriers. There do appear, nevertheless, to be traces of the ancestral ablutions surfacing in the Roman aetiology of the festivals, as was earlier noted (see §§10.5.1 and 10.5.2). Romulus is said to have disappeared in the midst of a soaking rain; he is said to have disappeared in the vicinity of the Caprae Palus, the 'Goat's Marsh', that body of water located within the Campus Martius, the dedicated warrior space, in proximity to which women offer sacrifice to Juno Caprotina in the celebration of the Nonae Caprotinae. The pool and basin found beneath the cult assemblage of the Volcanal, and neighboring areas in which the ground level was artificially lowered prior to the initial paving of the Comitium, are consistent with the significance of a water feature in the aetiologies of the warrior crises of the Poplifugia/Nonae Caprotinae.

One suspects that in earliest Rome, warrior-ablution rites of primitive Indo-European origin were still conducted. The Italic tradition of the post-traumatic warrior Semo Sancus whose *ira* and *aestus* are cooled by the spring located within the Aventine grove of Bona Dea must preserve a poetic memory of just such an ancestral rite. More than that, an expression of that archaic rite, *mutatis mutandis*, of robbing the warrior of his *furor* continues to be practiced in Rome. It is no longer a rite of ablution that follows upon the gaze of the erotic feminine; it is instead a rite of movement through space, affiliated in name with burgeoning feminine eroticism and in aetiology with the intense gaze of the feminine erotic (Horatia) and the reciprocal *ferox* (literally 'beast-eyed') gaze of the post-traumatic warrior out of control (Horatius) – namely, the rite of the *sororium tigillum*. The gaze of the warrior who dares to reciprocate the gaze of the erotic feminine is a bestial gaze, belonging to the savage world, and one that will lead to the warrior's own undoing. In his 1969 monograph on gaze in the Vedic ritual, Gonda draws attention to the danger that is perceived to lie in the gaze of a beast in Vedic conceptualizing: "the look of an animal which is regarded as powerful may be dangerous."[37] The gaze of a snake is considered poisonous and can "exert a baleful influence. . . . Hence, Sanskrit names of this animal such as *dṛgviṣa-* or *dṛṣṭiviṣa-* 'in whose glance is poison'."[38] Because of the danger of the gaze, a poisonous serpent seer must not be allowed to gaze upon the Soma sacrifice (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 6.1.4). But there is a remedy for the dangers that lie in the gaze of the serpent as specified in the *Atharva Veda*:[39]

> The harm done by the eye of a snake may however be counteracted by a magically potent reciprocation of the glance: *AV*. 5.13.4 "With sight (*cakṣuṣuā*) I smite thy sight; with poison I smite thy poison; die, O snake . . ."[40]

This feature of the gaze that characterizes the primitive Indo-European myth and, almost certainly, the ancestral ritual of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior, is self-evident in the annalistic tradition of Horatius and Horatia. It figures conspicuously in the account of Semo Sancus among the priestess and devotees of Bona Dea. As mentioned earlier, however, it is a feature about which the aetiologies and reported rites of the Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae are quiet, unless an element of the erotic gaze figures implicitly in the ambulations of the brilliantly attired slave-women and their salacious discoursing with the men whom they meet.

What one finds in these Roman ritual traditions of early July is instead a pronounced emphasis on enunciation – a seeming substitution of ritual uttering for ritual gazing. The aforementioned slave-women, one ritual personification of the erotic feminine, engage in speech acts as they process in their frippery. Preceding (Plutarch *Cam.* 33.6) this procession of the *nonariae*, the throngs of the *populus Romanus* move from within the city into the Campus Martius, a ritual re-enacting the response to one warrior-crisis or another, calling out various male names – local and common ones underscores Plutarch (*Rom.* 29.2; *Cam.* 33.5) – ones thus readily called up spontaneously. The masses of the Quirites thus engage the warrior element not visually, as representatives of the "third estate" had done in ancestral Indo-European rites, but verbally.

Yet the verbal element is not otherwise absent from the primitive Indo-European tradition. As we have seen, an enunciative act itself plays a crucial role in the recovery of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior in the Indic case: the isolated and diminished Indra regains his *balam*, physical power, as he is hymned by Bṛhaspati, divine priest who is accompanied by a delegation of society that has journeyed into the remote space of the withdrawn warrior, having been sought out by Fire and feminine. We saw that in the Caucasus, in East Circassian tradition, the raging dysfunctional Batraz is robbed of his rage verbally rather than visually when under the direction of a clairvoyant woman the Narts assemble their women and expose them to that marauding warrior: *mutatis mutandis* it is the same stratagem utilized to diffuse CúChulainn and Semo Sancus of *ferg* and *ira/aestus*, respectively (see §8.5.2).

The coupling of gaze and utterance (*mantra*) is well attested in Vedic ritual tradition: "the combination of gaze and consecratory formula is, for good or ill, especially efficacious."[41] Gonda summarizes much of the evidence, noting that the ritual use of gaze can have mythic underpinnings: "[A] definite way of looking may in performing a rite be a replica of a mythical event."[42] The power of the feminine

gaze and the effect of gazing upon the feminine find various ritual expressions. For example, in certain wedding rites the bride must gaze at the pole star, and surrounding stellar bodies, and chant a formula that addresses the steadfastness of the pole star: by so doing she transfers that quality of the star to herself in her new role as wife.[43] In the performance of the Soma ritual, the girding of the sacrificer's wife with a cord, in order to conceal that impure part of her that is "below the navel" (see *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.3.1.13), "was," in Gonda's words, "to prevent the woman from transferring by her looks something inauspicious."[44] While teaching the *pravargya* rite,[45] one must not gaze at a woman – or at a *śudra*, a dog, or a crow – lest some harmful element of the object looked at should be transferred to the one who is gazing.[46] If a man and a woman are seen as they have sexual intercourse, the sex act is deemed 'defective' (*vyṛddham*), generating ritual pollution, and the one who gazes upon them "runs the serious risk of becoming impure and infected with 'evil'."[47] The eyes of a bride are to be anointed with butter, as *Rig Veda* 10.85.44 is chanted, for the protection of the husband.[48] To gaze at a naked person, among other objects, is "an indication of discord or misfortune" (*Gobhila Smṛti* 2.163, 165).[49]

In Vedic tradition, gaze and utterance appear at times to be interchangeable. For example, Gonda observes:[50]

> The compound *cákṣurmantra-* which is, in association with *durhārda-* 'unfriendly', *AV* 2.7.5 used in a sense opposed to that of *suhārd-* 'friendly' and translated by Whitney-Lanman as 'eye-conjurer', might indeed have qualified the man whose *mantras* ('formulas') are in his eyes, that is who can achieve with his eyes those baleful effects which are usually brought about by incantations.

Compare too the alternation of what Calame calls "linguistic knowledge" and "visual knowledge" in Greek drama.[51] Such ocular and glottal exchanges should certainly be situated along the diachronic axis of ritual that links the Romans and their Indo-European forebears.

From a synchronic perspective it is significant that just as the gaze of the nude feminine in effect binds the power of the warrior in ancestral tradition, so in Roman religious contexts enunciations can be binding. This is a point that Bettini, following upon Benveniste, makes clear in his earlier-mentioned (see §3.4) study of *fari*:[52]

> According to Benveniste, *fas*, just like *fatum*, belongs to the sphere

of *fari*: thus *fas est* means 'what is willed by the gods.'[53] If this hypothesis is correct, then in the case of *fas* as well, "speech" designated with the verb *fari* appears to be powerful and capable of "binding," defining nothing less than the boundaries between what is licit and illicit, what is permissible and what is forbidden.

We saw that one and the same Roman ritual event and space can be styled both *optimus* and *nefas/funestus* (participating in an alternation of a different sort; see §3.2.2.1 and 4.3.1), where *nefas* cultically equates to *funestus*, and that the opposition is sensitive to the context of *comitium*, a gathering of the Roman masses.

The space of the Niger Lapis, vestigial marker of the archaic Volcanal *in Comitio*, sanctuary of Fire and bound up spatially with the crisis of the disappearing warrior-king Romulus, participates in such an oscillation. Mirroring the status of Vulcan's sanctuary *in Campo*, the Volcanal is a space proper for the meeting of Romulus and his co-regent Titus Tatius, Sabine warrior-king, but not for an assembly of the masses. Within the context of *comitium* it is *locus funestus*, 'sinister space', a cultic condition of *nefas*, element of the language of the forbidden – of ritual language that is binding. The designation of the space as such must be a synchronic consequence of diachronic ritual expressions of the power of *la troisième fonction*. The ancestral ritual gaze by which *la classe des cultivateurs* exerted power over *la classe des guerriers* – over the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior – has succumbed in Roman cult to the sphere of ritual enunciation – the visual to the linguistic.

In other words, the primitive Indo-European gaze of the "third estate" that binds the enraged dysfunctional warrior and so facilitates his ritual recovery for the sake of society has over time morphed into something notionally menacing in a particular Roman outcome of the ancestral tradition. In a cult space – *locus optimus* – beyond the archaic *pomerium*, sacred periphery cognate with the boundary beyond which, I have argued, the rites of the dysfunctional warrior are performed in the ancestral tradition, the presence of the masses at the site of the warrior's crisis makes of that space a *locus funestus* – space that could be styled *nefas* in the binding language of cult. Some similar historical process, or comparable ritual (re-)interpretation, must lie behind the specification made in ancient handbooks of Roman augury to which Cicero refers (see §3.2.2.1): the *optimum auspicium*, the 'best omen', in *all* things, occurs when the augurs observe Jupiter's lightning on the left of delimited augural space. There is, however, one sole exception: the observation is deemed *vitium* 'unfavorable augury' when it occurs in the context of *comitium* – *comitium* is *nefas* (*Div*. 2.42–43). The gaze

of the augurs (*la classe des prêtres*) is threatened or compromised by the gaze of the masses (*la classe des cultivateurs*). The same motivating force must lie behind the requirement that the sacred objects housed in Vesta's temple, where burns Rome's sacred flame, are ἀπόρρητα τοῖς πολλοῖς 'forbidden to the masses', they are things not to be spoken of (ἀπόρρητα) – they must be kept τοῖς πολλοῖς ἄδηλα 'imperceptible to the masses' (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom*. 2.66.2–3, 6; see §3.3.2): speech and vision collude. Likewise, the gaze of the masses must not fall upon the γεγραμμένα 'things written' in Numa's sacred books; those words are ἀπόρρητα: such a visual encounter would be *nefas*. The Victimarii, cult specialists conspicuously associated with the military, turn the books into flames within the space of the Comitium under the gaze of the masses, *in conspectu populi* (Livy 40.29.14; Plutarch *Numa* 22.2–5). Is this ritual destruction of the sacred writings a metonymic reflex of the ancestral doctrine of the warrior's fate if his gaze be unaverted from that of the masses? Whether the answer to that question be "yes" or "no," it seems clear that we find in Rome a vestige of an ideological or ritual dynamic in which *la classe des cultivateurs* potentially holds power over *la classe des prêtres* as well as *la classe des guerriers*.

But we have seen this already. The very appellation *Nonae Caprotinae* probably reflects as much. The anchoring of the festal name *Nonae Caprotinae* in the body of water that lies within the Campus Martius and that plays a significant role aetiologically and cultically in the ritual complex of July 5/7, embodying a fundamental feature (APPLICATION OF WATERS) of the primitive Indo-European myth and ritual of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior – the Caprae Palus 'Goat's Marsh' – a connection advanced by Plutarch (Rom. 29.2; *Cam*. 33.7), is a datum that one suspects to be genuine. It is a name that at some moment becomes attached to the actual Nones of Quintilis (July 7), the day that is also the celebration of the festival of animal fecundity notated *Palibus II* in the oldest surviving Roman calendar, the *Fasti Antiates maiores*. In some different moment, the term *Nonae Caprotinae* can be equally applied to July 5, the day of the Poplifugia. This festival, the Poplifugia, as we have noted, is the only festival marked in the *fasti* in large capitals that falls between the Kalends of a month and the Nones (see §5.3.3). Its occurrence within that temporal span thwarts in July the binding enunciation of the Rex Sacrorum that occurs each month on the Nones, the declaration of the sacred days to be observed within the remainder of the month. The enunciations of July 5 are not those of the Rex Sacrorum, representative of *la classe des prêtres*, but are instead the enunciations of the masses as they move through time and space, enacting the rites of the response of the *populus Romanus* to the crisis of the warrior: *la classe des cultivateurs*

deploys its own ritual utterances, and in so doing preempts and frustrates those of the priest. It is likely for this reason that *Nonae Caprotinae* becomes a folk appellation for July 5: the fifth day of the month is that of the Nones in most months, though not in July; but *la classe des cultivateurs* has made of July 5 a Nones of its own, and so it bears the name of an animal emblematic of the essence of that element of society – provided for the naming by the aetiologically and ritually relevant watery locale of the related rites of the Campus Martius. July 5, day of the Poplifugia, is by the self-assertion of the realm of the herder-cultivator a "Goat Nones." From this day (July 5), the use of the term *Nonae Caprotinae* must have spread to the day of *Palibus II*, the actual Nones of July, drawing along with it the name *Poplifugia*, resulting in the nomenclatural ambiguities that we examined in Chapter 2.

Perhaps it is a consequence of this same interclass dynamic that the gaze of the masses in the ancestral rites of the post-traumatic warrior has been reinvented in Rome as something menacing: a menace to the realm of the cult specialist. Or perhaps there is no quantifiable rationale that underlies the reinterpretation of the presence of the masses at the site of the warrior's crisis as a phenomenon that makes of that space a *locus funestus*: perhaps it is fundamentally the outcome of Roman, or Italic, sacerdotal casuistry – of, in effect, guilt by association. In a world of religious binding language, the presence of the masses in the cult space of the warrior-in-crisis – the dysfunctional warrior – becomes *nefas*. Whatever the historical pathways, some process of transference has occurred. What is at work here is likely not in any sense a "logical" process, or a reasoned process outside of the bounds of cult doctrine – not even a process of natural evolution, to the extent that socio-cultural evolutionary developments can be characterized as "natural." One is reminded of the reversal seen in the tale of the dysfunctional warrior Camillus, the second Romulus, in which it is the animus of the *plebs* that sends the warrior into the remote space of exile, in which it is the *populus* that brings on the crisis that compromises the prowess of the warrior.

This transference must be bound in part to changes in social organization. In documented Rome, the tripartite class distinctions of the primitive Indo-European myth and ritual of the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior are of course no longer societally current. *La classe des cultivateurs* is not fully distinct from *la classe des guerriers*: the plebeian masses supply a significant portion of the military contingent. The Latin term *populus* is itself saddled by semantic heterogeneity, as has been suggested by earlier discussions in this work: *populus* denotes both the 'people as a whole' and the 'common

masses', and at times is even contrasted with *plebs*. What we find instead in the aetiologies and recorded rituals of the Poplifugia and Nonae Caprotinae is a preservation of primitive Indo-European tripartite ideological conceptualizing; such sustained ideology is well attested in the religious structures of Rome, as in the case of the gods of the Pre-Capitoline triad, and the Flamines who serve them, and other examples discussed in the preceding chapters (see §5.3 for the Pre-Capitoline triad).

There is something of the primitive *troisième fonction* that remains for a time a productive ideological component of the plebeian masses: in other words, the inherited ideology of the realm of fertility continues to generate new cultural expressions – expressions emanating from or attached to the body of the *plebs*. We see it, for example, in the establishment of the so-called Aventine Triad. At the time of the plebeian secession to that hill outside of the city called the Mons Sacer in 494 BC (the so-called First Secession), an act of social protest and separation brought on by deprivation and debt, the *plebs* established their own assembly and appointed tribunes and aediles. In conjunction with this, the plebeian masses dedicated a temple to Ceres, Liber, and Libera on the Aventine. While the particular assemblage of gods involved may have been influenced by Greek cults of Demeter in the south of Italy, as is commonly suspected,[54] with the Italian fertility deities Liber and Libera translatively substituting for Dionysus and Persephone (though the Greek triad is not attested in southern Italy), or else being progressively assimilated to these Greek gods, the enshrining of three deities embodying the essence of *la troisième fonction* in the cult center of the *plebs* must be significant, particularly when contrasted with the Etruscanesque divine collocations of the nearby Capitoline temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus of the later sixth century BC – in which, however, there remained a full expression of primitive Indo-European tripartition embodied in the deities of what I have elsewhere called the Minor Capitoline triad.[55] It is the case that the vowing of the Aventine temple is said to have occurred at a time of food shortages (see Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom*. 6.17.3, where a consultation of the Sibylline Books is recounted), but if Ceres' particular association is with grain, the domain of Liber and Libera is more broadly one of fecundity and human sexuality and sensuality, as is underscored by their festival of March 17, Roman expression of the Italian Liberalia, with its phallic imagery and obscene enunciations and the putting on of the *toga virilis*, signifying a crossing of the threshold separating boyhood and manhood.[56] The pair, Liber and Libera, writes Augustine, following Varro, presides over the seed of men and women respectively (*De. civ. D*. 4.11) – over the releasing of those seeds in

sexual intercourse (6.9). He adds that women are attached to the temple of Liber – and wine, as it stimulates libido. Significant in this regard as well is an observation offered by Cornell, who writes:[57]

> We should also note that under the *lex sacrata* a transgressor was pronounced *sacer* to Jupiter, and his belongings became the property of Ceres. This suggests that the plebeian connection with Ceres goes back to the beginning.

The reference is to the law that provided the basis for the authority of the Plebeian Tribunes (see Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* 6.89.3–4; cf. Livy 3.55.5–13).[58]

Consider too the new-year festival of Anna Perenna, celebrated annually on the Ides of March (March 15, two days prior to the Liberalia), when plebeian masses pour into Rome for bawdy celebrations braced up by excessive drinking (Ovid *Fasti* 3.523–542).[59] In exploring possible identities of the festival's namesake, Ovid rehearses a tale (*nec a veri dissidet illa fide* 'not too distant from the truth' [3.662]) set in the context of the Plebeian flight to the Mons Sacer (3.663–664): when the provisions that the *plebs* had brought with them were exhausted, an old woman of Bovillae named Anna kept them nourished by providing them, the *populus*, as the poet denotes the plebeian masses, with rustic cakes (3.671–674):[60]

> *Atque ita per populum fumantia mane solebat*
> *Dividere: haec populo copia grata fuit.*
> *Pace domi facta signum posuere Perennae,*
> *Quod sibi defectis illa ferebat opem.*
> Every morning she shared them among the *populus*
> Piping hot; the *populus* loved her largesse.
>
> When domestic peace returned, a statue was raised
> To Perenna for aiding their distress.

Ovid then follows this pericope with an aetiological tale (3.675–696) of why it is that on this day of Anna Perenna's festival, *cantent . . . obscena puellae* 'girls chant obscenities' (3.675). Mars Gradivus lusted after Minerva. Confiding in Anna Perenna, the war god asked the old woman to assist him in satisfying his passions by arranging a tryst with the goddess. Anna delayed, but as Mars continued to press upon her, agreed to the request. The object of Mars' desires was led into his bedchamber, but as he prepared to kiss his veiled lover, the god recognized her to be not Minerva, but Anna Perenna in disguise

(3.692–696):[61]

Nunc pudor elusum, nunc subit ira, deum.
Ridet amatorem carae nova diva Minervae,
Nec res hac Veneri gratior ulla fuit.
Inde ioci veteres obscenaque dicta canuntur,
Et iuvat hanc magno verba dedisse deo.
First shame and then rage prick the fooled god.
The new goddess laughs at dear Minerva's lover;
Nothing delighted Venus more than this.
And so old jokes and obscene verses are chanted;
They rejoice that she tricked the great god.

The March 15 festival of the plebeian masses is characterized by pronounced elements of fertility and sexuality – followed in two-day's time by the Liberalia, a *de facto* continuation in celebratory theme – and associated with it is an aetiology in which the preserver of the *plebs*, of the *populus*, thwarts the sexual intentions of the warrior Mars. In a now familiar scenario, we see a figure associated with the masses, an old woman, deified, confronting the feverishness of *la deuxième fonction*, though in this instance the outcome of the act is the generation of the *ira* of the warrior by denial of the erotic feminine, rather than its elimination by exposure to the erotic feminine. And Venus, personification of the erotic, revels.[62]

The Indo-European societal response to the post-traumatic dysfunctional warrior is a response of the totality of society – a response requisite for the continued proper functioning and survival of society as a whole. We have seen the involvement of practitioners of what Benveniste terms the "science of the priest-magician" (i.e., elements of *la classe des prêtres*): the priestess of Bona Dea and her cognate sorceress/clairvoyant figures, for example; and Bṛhaspati, the 'master of prayer', priest among the gods, who is accompanied by a heterogeneous delegation of gods, seers, and gandharvas as he seeks out the withdrawn and diminished Indra. The specialist in physical power also plays a role: when the raging CúChulainn turns aside, seeking to avoid the dangers lying in the gaze of the nude women of Emain Macha, he is restrained and placed in the vats of cooling-water by fellow warriors of the Ulaid (*la classe des guerriers*) to be robbed of his *ferg*. But at the core of the process of the recovery of the post-traumatic warrior is the role played by representatives of the realm of fecundity and sexuality, *la troisième fonction*, whose intervention is crucial for the well-being of society, whose power in this operation exceeds that of the practitioners of physical force whom they seek to

restore to functionality.

With the enlargement of the Palatine *pomerium*, the July rites commemorating the popular response to the crisis of the warrior in Rome were necessarily – eventually – shifted from the site of the Volcanal and neighboring Comitium to the extra-*pomerial* space of the warrior, the Campus Martius. The earlier celebration I have referred to as the smaller Poplifugium, the later as the larger Poplifugium. One might hypothesize that the relocation of the space of celebration was coupled by an expansion of the time of celebration from one day to two, though these would not necessarily be contemporaneous developments. Perhaps the earlier rites continued for a while in the earlier location (a consequence of ritual, or ritualistic, tenacity), while the rites of the second day were conducted in the new locale. Or perhaps the place of celebration was relocated prior to the addition of a second day of rites. Regardless of the specifics of locale, the rites of July 7 must have their origin in an expansion of the observances of July 5: the resulting structure of rites observed iteratively on odd-numbered days with intervening even-numbered (inauspicious) days is typical of Roman festivals of more than a single day's duration.

The appended day – July 7 – of the celebration of the response of the *populus* to the crisis of the warrior is one that is thoroughly grounded in the realm of *la troisième fonction*. The role of *la classe des cultivateurs* is magnified – to the virtual exclusion of the remainder of society. It is that day designated to be the celebration of *Palibus II*, deity – or deities – of animal fecundity. This continuation of the observance of the warrior crisis – disappearance of the warrior-king Romulus, one still in his prime for combat, or retreat of Roman warriors in the face of an invading Latin horde – is thus made to coincide with worship of the agrarian deity who is likewise worshipped on the day that commemorates Romulus's augury and foundation of Rome and his ploughing of the Palatine *pomerium* (and, "coincidentally," birthday of Numa, the Sabine who emerges from remote space to resume Romulus's rule of Rome) – the day of the Parilia, April 21 (later to be called the *Romaea*), with its primitive Indo-European forms – when Ovid (*Fasti* 4.731) enjoins the goddess's worshipers with the imperative: *I, pete virginea, populus, suffimen ab ara* 'Go, *populus*, seek fumigant from the virginal altar'.[63] July 7 is likewise that day that will come to be denoted the *Ancillarum Feriae*, 'Festival of the Slave-Women', celebrating the resolution of Rome's warrior-crisis facilitated by the sagacious Tutula and her followers, personification of the erotic feminine in Roman aetiology of the rites of the Nonae Caprotinae, when women will gather in the Campus Martius in the vicinity of the Caprae Palus 'Goat's Marsh', shaded by

branches from a *caprificus* 'goat-fig' and make sacrifice to Juno Caprotina. The procession of the *populus Romanus* on this day, beyond the sacred boundary, into the remote space of the warrior, is a notionally plebeian affair.

In his 1907 study in which he attempts to restore the reading of the mutilated inscription on the *cippus* found beneath the Niger Lapis, Warren comments:

> Although Dionysius 6.90 connects Ζεὺς Δειμάτιος ['Zeus (i.e. Jupiter) who Terrifies'] with the first secession of the plebs, and his words imply a sort of panic-flight, and although in 6. 62, 68, and 96 he speaks of the seceders as φυγάδες ['ones who flee'], I am not bold enough to connect the *Poplifugium* [sic] with the secession of the plebs. The institution seems to be much too ancient for that. But perhaps inscriptions like ours with *Juppiter Territor* ['Jupiter who Terrifies'][64] may have had some influence in shaping the legend of the secession.

I would dare be no bolder than Warren – his caution is sage, no doubt – but one might wonder if the festival of July 7, thick with the symbolism of *la classe des cultivateurs*, extending the celebration of the ultimately salvific response of the *populus* to the crisis of the warrior beyond July 5, may find its inception in the plebeian social unrest traditionally dated to the early Republic. The rites of July 5 (the Poplifugia) are surely much older. But might those of July 7 (the Nonae Caprotinae) be bound to the struggle of the *plebs*, with which social collectivity, as we have seen, the ideological structures of the primitive Indo-European *troisième fonction* continue to be expressed – including, here, the ideology of the crucial role that that element plays in the resolution of the warrior's dysfunction? Might it be in such a setting of social unrest that the folk attribution *Nonae Caprotinae* is first applied to the day of the Poplifugia (July 5), the day on which the masses appropriate as their own the Nonal authority and enunciation of the Rex Sacrorum, patrician representative of *la classe des prêtres*?

And so the *populus* celebrates its power. It revels in its role in the resolution of the warrior's dysfunctionality, ritually imagining itself to be restoring the warrior to functionality. And in so doing, it perceives itself to be restoring a proper order to society, making society secure, doing what the *populus* had done for millennia before, and has done for millennia since.

[1] On the Indo-European *Männerbünde*, see, *inter alia*, Wikander 1938; Dumézil 1970:xi–xiii; Benveniste 1969:1:111–115; Speidel 2002; and especially McCone 1987.

[2] See Woodard 2006:261–264.

[3] On the unboundary, see Woodard 2006:245–250; 265–267.

[4] Dumézil 1970:25.

[5] On the tradition, see especially Bloomfield 1893:143–163.

[6] See Dumézil 1970:29–32; 1995:1:279–280; and see §§8.4.4.3 and 8.7.2.1 on Allen's (2003) work extending Dumézil's analysis.

[7] And Livy adds that temples were vowed to Pallor and Pavor.

[8] Dumézil 1970:34.

[9] On Ops and Saturnus as members of divine set identified as "the gods of Titus Tatius" (on which see Woodard 2006:4–6) and their festivals within the calendrical sequence of agrarian festivals, see Dumézil 2000:277–282.

[10] Vendryes 1928:161.

[11] One might here compare Caesar's account (*B Gall.* 2.13–15) of the peaceful surrender of the town he calls Bratuspantium during his

offensive against the Belgae five years earlier, as some have (see le Roux 1966:370). He reports that *omnes maiores* 'all the senior men' came out to meet the Romans, with their hands outstretched, proclaiming that they wished to place themselves in Caesar's protection and that they would not fight. When the army reached the city walls and was making camp there, Caesar reports that women and children repeated the exercise *ex muro* 'from the wall'. The crucial element of nudity is here absent from the account of the women. One would judge that the two events, that which occurred at the peaceful surrender of Bratuspantium and that which occurred at the Roman defeat at Gergovia are rather different (in other words, the former account is not, as Le Roux (1966:370) characterizes it, "Un passage comparable [mais sans mise à nu du sein]"), and that the earlier experience may have, understandably, misinformed Caesar's comprehension of the latter.

[12] Le Roux's short treatment (1966) prominently includes a dismissal of Vendryes's analysis, which, unfortunately, comes across as being of a fundamentally personal nature. She writes, for example:

Si Vendryes avait eu une expérience plus grande du vocabulaire religieux il n'aurait pas employé l'expression « geste rituel » qui implique bien d'autres résonances. Les femmes de Gergovie n'accomplissent pas un geste à portée rituelle. . . .

But the women of Gergovia are in fact performing a ritual act.

[13] On *glastum*, see Knauer 1993:31–32, with references.

[14] For locations, consult the catalogue in Freitag 2004:121–162.

[15] And is still earlier attested as the name of a British ship during the time of the American Revolution. For discussion of the term as applied to dance, see Freitag 2004:57–58. On the "problem of the name"

broadly considered, see her Chapter 3.

[16] On *Sheela-na-gigs* generally, see, *inter alia*, Freitag 2004; Kelly 1996; and Ford 1998, whose treatment is in part a response to Andersen 1977.

[17] Freitag 2004:4.

[18] Freitag 2004:5–6.

[19] Ford 1998:183.

[20] Ford 1998:182.

[21] Ford 1998:183. Ford here follows Caputi (1994), quoting her claims that (p. 25:) "the feminine is disturbing . . . because it reflects human mortality . . . a woman's body stands in for all that is aligned with nature, all that thwarts masculine cultural achievement"; and (p. 38) "the female genitals are the envoys of otherness; they denote the other side of civilization."

[22] See Crooke 1926:69–72 on nude religious practices in India contemporary with that work, many of which appear to be fundamentally concerned with matters of fertility.

[23] Gonda 1978:54.

[24] See Bloomfield 1886:469–472.

[25] Gonda 1980:73.

[26] Olivelle (2005:270) would construe the clause to refer only to the Brahmin's wife, not to women generally. Contrast Bühler 1886:135–136.

[27] See Bühler 1879:216.

[28] Gonda 1980:73.

[29] See Woodard 2006:259–264.

[30] Compare *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.4.1.10–19.

[31] Even if the identification of a common etymon for Sanskrit *brahman* and Latin *flamen* should be problematic. On the similar constraints, see Dumézil 1935; 2000:571n2.

[32] "And of many other offerings": Keith 1998:303; see also Woodard 2006:170–171.

[33] Keith 1998:303.

[34] Keith here refers to *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* 3.6.2 and *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra* 13.21.3; see also Oldenberg 1988:223. On these texts, see the ensuing remarks.

[35] On *tapas*, see, *inter alia*, Oldenberg 1988:220–224; Keith 1998:300–

302; Eliade 2009:106–109; and Hiltebeitel 1977:331–332 on *tapas* in the Nahuṣa episode.

[36] On *tejas*, see §8.4.1.1.

[37] Gonda 1969:25.

[38] Gonda 1969:25–26.

[39] Gonda 1969:26.

[40] Gonda (1969:26n21) notes: "The Paipp. recension (8, 2, 3) however reads 'with force I smite thy force (*balam*).'"

[41] Gonda 1969:8.

[42] Gonda 1969:45. See also page 24 (with note 17):

A deliberate look cast in a ritual context may enable a person to come into contact with, and to repeat for his good, a mythological event which is replete with beneficial power. Thus by looking intentionally at an object which a god had, in mythological times, seen or regarded first one becomes able to repeat a divine act of power.

[43] Gonda 1969:23–24.

[44] Gonda 1969:27.

[45] A portion of the Soma sacrifice: see Keith 1998:332–333.

[46] Gonda 1969:32.

[47] Gonda 1969:32.

[48] Gonda 1969:33.

[49] Gonda 1969:58.

[50] Gonda 1969:39.

[51] See Calame 2005, especially pp. 107–113.

[52] Bettini 2008:330. On *fas*, see §§3.3 and 3.4.

[53] Here, Bettini cites Benveniste: see Benveniste 1969:2:139–140.

[54] See, *inter alia*, the discussions of Le Bonniec 1958:279–311 and Cornell 1995:263–264.

[55] See Woodard 2006, especially Chapter 1.

[56] See, *inter alia*, Boyle and Woodard 2004:221–226.

[57] Cornell 1995:263. On the association of the *plebs* with Ceres, see also Spaeth 1996:81–102. Compare Forsythe 2005:173, whose view is washed a bit too well and would denude the Romans of their own cultural heritage.

[58] On *lex sacrata*, see Festus p. 318M.

[59] On the festival of Anna Perenna, see, *inter alia*, Warde Fowler 1899:50–54; Woodard 2011:309–310; Boyle and Woodard 2004:219–223; Newlands 1996.

[60] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:74, with modifications.

[61] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:75, with modifications.

[62] Minerva has her own affiliation with the realm of goods-production as deity of those who produce crafts, celebrated as such two days after the Liberalia (March 19) during the festival of the greater *Quinquatrus* (see Boyle and Woodard 2004:226–228). Dumézil (1996:306) comments: "The comic intervention in her behalf of the aged Anna of Bovillae, five days before the *Quinquatrus*, rather places Minerva on the side of the plebs and against the patrician ruffian Mars."

[63] The translation is that of Boyle and Woodard 2004:105, with modification.

[64] Which divine name Warren would read in the *cippus* inscription.

Bibliography

Adams, J. N. 1995. *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire*. Leiden.

Aldrete, Gregory S. 2007. *Floods of the Tiber in Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.

Alföldi, Andrew. 1965. *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor.

Allen, N. J. 1987. "The Ideology of the Indo-Europeans: Dumézil's Theory and the Idea of a Fourth Function." *International Journal of Moral and Social Studies* 2: 23–39.

Allen, N. J. 2003 (2000). "The Indra-Tullus Comparison." In *Indo-European Language and Culture: Essays in Memory of Edgar C. Polomé*, part I. Edited by B. Drinka and J. Salmons. *General Linguistics* 40: 148–171.

Allen, N. J. 2009. "Early Rome and Indo-European Comparison: Dominique Briquel on Two Crises." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 37: 489–508.

Ammerman, Albert J. 1996. "The Comitium in Rome from the Beginning." *American Journal of Archaeology*. 100: 121–136.

Andersen, Jørgen. 1977. *The Witch on the Wall: Medieval Erotic Sculpture in the British Isles*. Copenhagen.

Andrews, Alfred C. 1949. "The Bean and Indo-European Totemism." *American Anthropologist* 51: 274–292.

Ash, Rhiannon. 2007. *Tacitus: Histories Book II*. Cambridge, UK.

Baldi, Philip. 1999. *The Foundations of Latin*. Berlin.

Barham, Peter. 2004. *Forgotten Lunatics of the Great War*. New Haven.

Bartholomae, Christian. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg.

Beard, Mary. 2009. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge, MA.

Benveniste, Émile. 1932. "Les classes sociales dans la tradition avestique." *Journal Asiatique* 221: 117–134.

Benveniste, Émile. 1945. "Symbolisme social dans les cultes gréco-

italiques." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 129: 5–16.

Benveniste, Émile. 1969. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. 2 volumes. Paris.

Benveniste, Émile. 1970. "Les valeurs économique dans le vocabulaire indo-européen." In *Cardona et al.* 1970: 307–320.

Benveniste, Émile. 1978. *Indo-European Language and Society*. London.

Benveniste, Émile. 2001. "Social Symbolism in Greco-Italic Cults." Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. In Loraux, Nagy, and Slatkin 2001, pp. 439–447. English translation of Benveniste 1945.

Benveniste, Émile, and Louis Renou. 1934. *Vṛtra et Vṛθragna: Étude de mythologie indo-iranienne*. Paris.

Best, R. I., and Osborn Bergin. 1929. *Lebor na huidre: Book of the Dun Cow*. Dublin.

Bettini, Maurizio. 2008. "Weighty Words, Suspect Speech: *Fari* in Roman Culture." *Arethusa* 41: 313–375.

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1886. "Seven Hymns of the Atharva-Veda." *The American Journal of Philology* 7: 466–488.

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1893. "Contributions to the Interpretation of the Veda." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15: 143–188.

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1899. *The Atharvaveda*. Strassburg.

Boas, Franz. 1897. *The Social Organization and the Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl*. Washington DC.

Bonnefoy Y., and W. Doniger (eds.). 1991. *Mythologies*. 2 volumes. Chicago.

Boulogne, Jacques (trans.). 2002. *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales*. Volume 4. Paris.

Boyce, Mary. 1996. *A History of Zoroastrianism*. Volume 1. Corrected edition. Leiden.

Boyle, Anthony J., and Roger D. Woodard. 2004. *Ovid: Fasti*. Revised edition. London.

Brennan, T. Corey. 2001. *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*. Volume 1: *Origins to 122 BC*. Oxford.

Briquel, Dominique. 2008. *La prise de Rome par les Gaulois: Lecture mythique d'un évènement historique*. Paris.

Brouwer, H. H. J. 1989. *Bona Dea: The Sources and a Description of the Cult*. Leiden.

Brunt, P. A. 1971. *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.–A.D. 14*. Oxford.

Brunt, P. A. 1975. "Two Great Roman Landowners." *Latomus* 34: 619–635.

Bühler, Georg. 1879. *The Sacred Laws of the Āryas*. Part 1. Oxford.

Bühler, Georg. 1886. *The Laws of Manu*. Oxford.

Bulloch, A. W. 1985. *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge, UK.

Burkert, Walter. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Translated by John Raffan. Cambridge, MA.

Burn, Robert. 1876. *Rome and the Campagna: An Historical and Topographic Description*. Cambridge, UK, and London.

Calame, Claude. 2005. *Mask of Authority: Fiction and Pragmatics in Ancient Greek Poetics*. Translated by Peter M. Burk. Ithaca, NY.

Cameron, Alan. 2004. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. Oxford.

Caputi, Mary. 1994. *Voluptuous Yearnings: A Feminist Theory of the Obscene*. Lanham, MD.

Cardona, George; Henry M. Hoenigswald, and Alfred Senn. 1970. *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*. Philadelphia.

Carlsen, Jesper. 1992. "*Magister Pecoris*: The Nomenclature and Qualifications of the Chief Herdsman in Roman Pasturage." *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 20: 59–65.

Carlsen, Jesper. 2001. *Vilici and Roman Estate Managers until AD 284*. Rome.

Charachidzé, Georges 1991a. "The Religion and Myths of the Ossets." *In Bonnefoy and Doniger* 1991, pp. 316–319.

Charachidzé, Georges 1991b. "The Religions and Myths of Armenia." *In Bonnefoy and Doniger* 1991, pp. 319–322.

Childers, Thomas. 2009. *Soldier from the War Returning*. Boston.

Coarelli, Filippo. 1983. *Il foro Romano*. 2 volumes. Rome.

Coarelli, Filippo. 1996. "Legio Lineata: L'iniziazione militare nel Sannio." *In Del Tutto Palma* 1996: 3–16.

Coarelli, Filippo. 1997. *Il campo Marzio*. Rome.

Coarelli, Filippo. 2007. *Rome and Environs: An Archeological Guide*.

Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Colarusso, John. 1989. “The Women of the Myths: The Satanaya Cycle.” *The Annual of the Society for the Study of Caucasia*. 2: 3–11.

Colarusso, John. 2002. *Nart Sagas from the Caucasus*. Princeton.

Comyn, David, and Patrick Dinneen (eds.). 1902–1914. *The History of Ireland by Geoffrey Keating, D.D*. London.

Conte, Gian Biagio. 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Translated by Joseph B. Solodow. Revised by Don Fowler and Glenn W. Most. Baltimore and London.

Cornell, T. J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome*. London.

Crooke, William. 1926. *Religion and Popular Folklore of Northern India*. Oxford.

Dean, Eric T., Jr. 1997. *Shook over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War*. Cambridge, MA.

Del Tutto Palma, Loretta (ed.). 1996. *La Tavola di Agnone nel contesto Italico*. Florence.

Delatte, Armand. 1930. “Faba Pythagorae cognata.” In *Serta Leodiensia: Mélanges de philologie classique publiés à l’occasion de l’indépendance de la Belgique*, pp. 33–57. Liège and Paris.

Dench, Emma. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines*. Oxford.

Depew, Mary. 1994. “*POxy* 2509 and Callimachus’ *Lavacrum Palladis*: αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς κούρη μεγάλοιο.” *Classical Quarterly* 44: 410–426.

Detienne, Marcel. 1994. *The Gardens of Adonis*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Princeton.

Dhand, Arti. 2008. *Woman as Fire, Woman as Sage: Sexual Ideology in the Mahābhārata*. Albany, NY.

Dumézil, Georges. 1930a. “La préhistoire indo-iranienne des castes.” *Journal Asiatique* 216: 109–130.

Dumézil, Georges. 1930b. *Légendes sur les Nartes*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1935. *Flamen-Brahman*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1938. “Vahagn.” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 117: 152–170.

Dumézil, Georges. 1942. *Horace et les Curiaces*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1954. *Rituels indo-européens à Rome*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1956. *Aspects de la fonction guerrière*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1964. *Aspekte der Kriegerfunktion bei den Indogermanen*. Darmstadt.

Dumézil, Georges. 1965. *Le livre des héros, légendes sur les Nartes*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1969. *Idées romaines*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1970. *The Destiny of the Warrior*. Translated by A. Hiltebeitel. Chicago.

Dumézil, Georges. 1973. *From Myth to Fiction*. Chicago.

Dumézil, Georges. 1975. *Fêtes romaines d'été et d'automne*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1978. *Romans de Scythie et d'alentour*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1980. *Camillus: A Study of Indo-European Religion as Roman History*. Edited, with an Introduction, by Udo Strutynski. Translation by Annette Aronowicz and Josette Bryson. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Dumézil, Georges. 1985. *Heur et malheur du guerrier*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1986. *Loki*. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1988. *Mitra–Varuna*. New York.

Dumézil, Georges. 1995. *Mythe et épopée*. Volumes 1, 2 and 3. Corrected edition. Paris.

Dumézil, Georges. 1996. *Archaic Roman Religion*. Translated by P. Krapp.Reprint edition. Baltimore.

Dumézil, Georges. 2000. *La religion romaine archaïque*. 2nd édition revised and corrected. Paris.

Dyson, Stephen L. 2010. *Rome: A Living Portrait of an Ancient City*. Baltimore.

Eggeling, Julius. 1995. *The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. Parts 1–5. Sacred Books of the East, vols. 12, 26, 41, 43, 44. Edited by F. Max Müller. Reprint edition. Delhi.

Eliade, Mircea. 2009. *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*. Princeton.

Ernout, Alfred, and Antoine Meillet. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. 4th edition. Paris.

Estienne, Sylvia, Francesca Prescendi, John Scheid, and Françoise van

Haeperen. 2005. “Les appariteurs des magistrates, des prêtres et des collèges sacerdotaux.” *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum* 5: 114–116.

Fantham, Elaine. 1998. *Ovid Fasti Book IV*. Cambridge, UK.

Faraday, L. Winifred. 1904. *Cattle-Raid of the Cualnge (Tain Bo Cuailnge): An Old-Irish Prose-Epic: Translated for the First Time from Leabhar na h-Uidhri and the Yellow Book of Lecan*. London.

Fick, August. 1894. *Die Griechischen Personennamen*. Göttingen.

Flobert, Pierre. 1985. *Varron: La langue latine: Livre VI*. Paris.

Flower, Michael A. 2008. *The Seer in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Ford, Patrick K. “The *WHICH* on the Wall: Obscenity Exposed in Early Ireland.” In *Ziolkowski* 1998, pp. 176–190.

Forsythe, Gary. 2005. *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Frayn, Joan M. 1984. *Sheep-Rearing and the Wool Trade in Italy during the Roman Period*. Liverpool.

Frazer, James. 1910. *Totemism and Exogamy*. 4 volumes. London.

Frazer, James. 1929. *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. 5 volumes. London.

Frazer, James. 1935. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Myth and Religion*. 3rd edition. New York.

Freitag, Barbara. 2004. *Sheela-na-gigs: Unravelling an Enigma*. New York.

Gamkrelidze, Thomas V., and Vjačeslav V. Ivanov. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. 2 volumes. Berlin.

Ganguli, Kisari Mohan. 1998. *The Mahabharata*. 12 volumes. Reprint edition. New Delhi.

Gantz, Jeffery. 1988. *Early Irish Myths and Sagas*. Reprint edition. Harmondsworth, UK

Gantz, Timothy. 1974. “*Lapis Niger*: The Tomb of Romulus.” *La parola del passato* 29: 350–361.

Garbutt, Kathleen. 2008. *Mahābhārata*. Book Five. Volume 1. New York.

Gershevitch, Ilya. 1959. *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*. Cambridge, UK.

Gjerstad, Einar. 1960. *Early Rome*. Volume 3. Lund.

Gonda, Jan. 1969. *Eye and Gaze in the Veda*. Amsterdam.

Gonda, Jan. 1978. *Hymns of the Ṛgveda not Employed in the Solemn Ritual*. Amsterdam.

Gonda, Jan. 1980. *Vedic Ritual: The Non-Solemn Rites*. Leiden.

Goold, G. (ed.). 1999. *Propertius: Elegies*. Revised ed. Cambridge, MA.

Green, Miranda. 1992. *Animals in Celtic Life and Myth*. London.

Griffith, Ralph T. H. 1995. *The Hymns of the Atharva-Veda*. Reprint edition. Delhi.

Grisward, Joël. 1969. "Le motif de l'épée jetée au lac: la mort d'Artur et la mort de Batraz." *Romania* 90: 289–340.

Gruen, Erich S. 1990. *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*. Leiden.

Guthrie, W. K. C. 2000. *A History of Greek Philosophy*. Volume 3: *The Fifth Century Enlightenment*. Reprint edition. Cambridge.

Hadaghat'la, Asker M. 1967. *Nartxer*. Miyeqwap'e [Maikop], Russia.

Halliday, W. R. 1924. "Passing under the Yoke." *Folklore* 35: 93–95.

Hellegouarc'h, J. 1970. "Le principat de Camille." *Revue des Études Latines* 48: 112–132.

Hiltebeitel, Alf. 1977. "Nahuṣa in the Skies: A Human King of Heaven." *History of Religions* 16: 329–350.

Hiltebeitel, Alf. 1990. *The Ritual of Battle: Krishna in the Mahābhārata*. Albany, NY.

Holloway, R. Ross. 1994. *The Archaeology of Early Rome and Latium*. London.

Holtzmann, Adolf. 1878. "Indra nach den Vorstellungen des *Mahābhārata*." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. 32: 290–340.

Hopkins, E. W. 1969. *Epic Mythology*. Reprint edition. New York.

Heurgon, Jacques. 1951. "Au dossier de Palès." *Latomus* 10: 277–278.

Jakobson, Roman. 1999. *Selected Writings: Contributions to Comparative Mythology – Studies in Linguistics and Philology 1972–1982*. Berlin.

Keith, Arthur Berriedale. 1967. *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Sanhita*. 2 vols. Reprint edition. Delhi.

Keith, Arthur Berriedale. 1998. *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*. Reprint edition. Delhi.

Kelly, Eamonn P. 1996. *Sheela-na-gigs: Origins and Functions*. Dublin.

King, Richard J. 2006. *Desiring Rome: Male Subjectivity and Reading Ovid's Fasti*. Columbus, OH.

Kinsella, Thomas, trans. 1970. *The Tain: From the Irish Epic Táin Bó Cuailnge*. Oxford.

Knauer, Elfriede R. 1993. "Roman Wall Paintings from Bostrotrecase: Three Studies in the Relationship between Writing and Painting. *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 28: 13–46.

Koestermann, Erich. 1967. *Cornelius Tacitus: Annalen*. Heidelberg.

Köves-Zulauf, Thomas. 1972. *Reden und Schweigen: Römische Religion bei Plinius Maior*. Munich.

Kretschmer, Paul. 1920. "Lat. *quirites* und *quiritare*." *Glotta* 10: 147–157.

Le Bonniec, Henri. 1958. *Le culte de Cérès a Rome*. Paris.

Le Roux, Françoise. 1966. "Pectore nudo." *Ogam* 18: 369–372.

Linderski, Jerzy. 1975. Review of Köves-Zulauf 1972. *Classical Philology* 70: 284–289.

Littleton, C. Scott, and Linda A. Malcor. 2000. *From Scythia to Camelot*. Reprint edition. New York.

Loraux, Nicole. 1995. *The Experiences of Tiresias: The Feminine and the Greek Man*. Princeton.

Loraux, Nicole, Gregory Nagy, and Laura Slatkin (eds.). 2001. *Antiquities*. New York.

Lüders, Heinrich. 1940. "Eine arische Anschauung über den Vertragsbruch." In *Philologica Indica: ausgewählte kleine Schriften von Heinrich Lüders*, pp. 438–463. Göttingen.

Lyon, David Gordon, and George Foot Moore. 1912. *Studies in the History of Religions*. New York.

Magdelain, A. 1976. "Le pomerium archaïque et le mundus." *Revue des etudes latines*. 54: 71–109.

Mallory, J. P., and D. Q. Adams. 2006. *The Oxford Introduction to Indo-*

European and the Proto-Indo-European World. Oxford.

Mallory, J. P., and D. Q. Adams. 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London and Chicago.

Mannhardt, Wilhelm. 1875–1877. *Antike Wald- und Feldkulte*. 2 volumes. Berlin.

Mannhardt, Wilhelm. 1884. *Mythologische Forschungen aus dem Nachlasse*. Strassburg.

McCall, Jeremiah B. 2002. *The Cavalry of the Roman Republic*. London.

McCone, Kim. 1987. "Hund, Wolf und Krieger bei den Indogermanen." In Meid 1987: 101–154.

Meid, Wolfgang. 1987. *Studien zum Indogermanischen Wortschatz*. Innsbruck.

Merkel, Rudolph. 1841. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. Berlin.

Meurant, Alain (ed.). 2011. *Routes et parcours mythiques : des textes à l'archéologie*. Brussels.

Miles, Gary B. 1986. "The Cycle of Roman History in Livy's First Pentad." *American Journal of Philology* 107: 1–33.

Miles, Gary B. 1997. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca, NY.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1966. "Procum Patricum." *Journal of Roman Studies* 56: 16–24.

Mommsen, Theodor. 2006. *A History of Rome*. Reprint edition. London.

Monier-Williams, Monier. 1979. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Reprint edition. Oxford.

Morales, Helen. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge, UK.

Mynors, R. A. B. 1994. *Georgics*. Oxford.

Neu, Erich, and Wolfgang Meid. 1979. *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*. Innsbruck.

Newlands, Carole. 1996. "Transgressive Acts: Ovid's Treatment of the Ides of March." *Classical Philology* 91: 320–338.

Nicolet, Claude. 1966. *L'ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine* (312–43). Paris.

Nicolet, Claude. 1988. *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. Translated by P. S. Falla. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Niebuhr, Barthold Georg. 1827. *The Roman History*. Volume 1. Translated by F. A. Walter. London.

O'Daly, Gerard J. P. 2002. *Augustine's City of God*. Reprint edition. Oxford.

O'Rahilly, Cecile. 1967. *Táin Bó Cúalnge: From the Book of Leinster*. Dublin.

O'Rahilly, Cecile. 1976. *Táin Bó Cúailnge: Recension 1*. Dublin.

Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*. Oxford.

Oldenberg, Hermann. 1988. *The Religion of the Veda*. Delhi.

Olivelle, Patrick. 2005. *Manu's Code of Law*. Oxford.

Palaima, Thomas G. 2000. "Courage and Prowess Afoot in Homer and the Vietnam of Tim O'Brien." *Classical and Modern Literature* 20: 1–22.

Palmer, Robert E. A. 1974. *Roman Religion and Roman Empire*. Philadelphia.

Parker, Robert. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.

Pascal, C. Bennett. 1981. "October Horse." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 85: 261–291.

Perret, Marion. 1974. "Eliot, the Naked Lady, and the Missing Link." *American Literature*. 46: 289–303.

Phillipson, Coleman. 1911. *The International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*. London.

Pinkerton, John. 1808–1814. *General Collection of Voyages and Travels*. 17 volumes. London.

Platner, Samuel Ball. 1929. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Revised by Thomas Ashby. Oxford.

Poucet, Jacques. 1967. *Recherches sur la légende sabine des origines de Rome*. Louvain.

Preller, Ludwig. 1881–83. *Römische Mythologie*. Edited by Henri Jordan. 2 volumes. 3rd edition. Berlin.

Pulgram, Ernst. 1978. *Italic, Latin, Italian*. Heidelberg.

Putter, Ad. 1997. "Sources and Backgrounds for Descriptions of the

Flood in Medieval and Renaissance Literature." *Studies in Philology* 94: 137–159.

Quilici, Lorenzo, and Stefania Quilici Gigli. 1986. *Fidenae (Latium Vetus V)*. Rome.

Quilici, Lorenzo, and Stefania Quilici Gigli. 1993. *Ficulea (Latium Vetus VI)*. Rome.

Radke, Gerhard. 1979. *Die Götter Altitaliens*. Münster Westfalen.

Ramsay, George Gilbert. 1909. *The Annals of Tacitus: Books XI–XVI*. London.

Rees, Brinley. 1991. "Cú Chulainn and Conchobar: The Warrior Hero in Irish Mythology." In Bonnefoy and Doniger 1991, pp. 270–271.

Rees, Alwyn, and Brinley Rees. 1989. *Celtic Heritage*. Reprint edition. London.

Rhode, Eric. 1987. *On Birth and Madness*. London.

Richards, E. G. 1998. *Mapping Time: The Calendar and Its History*. Oxford.

Richardson, L. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.

Rix, Helmut. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.

Rix, Helmut. 2002. *Sabellische Texte: Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*. Heidelberg.

Robertson, Noel. 1987. "The Nones of July and Roman Weather Magic." *Museum Helveticum* 44: 8–41.

Robinson, Fred Norris. 1912. "Satirists and Enchanters in Early Irish Literature." In Lyon and Moore 1912, pp. 95–130.

Rose, H. J. 1960. "Roman Religion 1910–1920." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 50: 161–172.

Ross Taylor, Lilly. 1990. *Roman Voting Assemblies: From the Hannibalic War to the Dictatorship of Caesar*. Ann Arbor.

Rüpke, Jörg. 1992. "You Shall Not Kill. Hierarchies of Norms in Ancient Rome." *Numen* 39: 58–79.

Rüpke, Jörg. 1995. *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit: Die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom*. Berlin.

Rüpke, Jörg. 2007. *The Religion of the Romans*. Cambridge, UK.

Russell, James, R. 2004. *Armenian and Iranian Studies*. Cambridge, MA.

Salmon, Edward Togo. 1967. *Samnium and the Samnites*. Cambridge, UK.

Scarborough, John. 1982. “Beans, Pythagoras, Taboos, and Ancient Dietetics.” *Classical World* 75: 355–358.

Scheid, John. 1998. *Commentarii fratrum Arvalum qui supersunt*. Rome.

Scheid, John. 2003. *An Introduction to Roman Religion*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Edinburgh.

Scheidel, Walter. 1990. “Free-born and Manumitted Bailiffs in the Graeco-Roman World.” *Classical Quarterly* 40: 591–593.

Schilling, R. 1991a. “Roman Divination” In Bonnefoy and Doniger 1991, pp. 584–597.

Schilling, R. 1991b. “The Arval Brethren.” In Bonnefoy and Doniger 1991, pp. 603–605.

Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1967. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden.

Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1981. *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen: mit sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen*. Innsbruck.

Schulze, Wilhelm. 1904. *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*. Zürich.

Schwegler, Albert. 1853–1858. *Römische Geschichte*. Edited by Ferdinand Friedrich Bauer. 2 volumes. Tübingen.

Scullion, Scott. 2002. “‘Nothing to Do with Dionysus’: Tragedy Misconceived as Ritual.” *Classical Quarterly* 52: 102–137.

Shay, Jonathan. 1994. *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character*. New York.

Shay, Jonathan. 2002. *Odysseus in America: Combat Trauma and the Trials of Homecoming*. New York.

Shephard, Ben. 2001. *A War of Nerves: Soldiers and Psychiatrists in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA.

Simonelli, Antonella. 2001. “Considerazioni sull’origine, la natura e l’evoluzione del *pomerium*.” *Aevum* 75: 119–162.

Sinclair, John. 1791–1799. *Statistical Account of Scotland*. 21 volumes. Edinburgh.

Sittig, Ernst. 1924. “Zwei etymologische Vermutungen.” *Zeitschrift für*

vergleichende Sprachforschung: 52: 204–211.

Spaeth, Barbette Stanley. 1996. *The Roman Goddess Ceres*. Austin, TX.

Speidel, Michael. 2002. "Berserks: A History of Indo-European 'Mad Warriors.'" *Journal of World History* 13: 253–290.

Strachan John, and J. G. O'Keeffe. 1912. The *Táin Bó Cuailnge from the Yellow Book of Lecan with Variant Readings from the Lebor na Huidre*. Dublin.

Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution*. Reprint edition. London.

Tatum, James. 2003. *The Mourner's Song: War and Remembrance from the Iliad to Vietnam*. Chicago.

Thieme, Paul. 1960. "The 'Aryan' Gods of the Mitanni Treaties." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 80: 301–317.

Thomson, Robert W. 1976. *Agathangelos: History of the Armenians*. Albany, NY.

Thomson, Robert W. 1980. *History of the Armenians*. 2nd printing. Cambridge, MA.

Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1912. "Táin Bó Cúailghni Nach H. 2. 17." *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 8: 525–554.

Trevelyan, Marie. 1909. *Folk-lore and Folk-stories of Wales*. London.

Tritle, Lawrence A. 2000. *From Melos to My Lai: War and Survival*. London.

Trubačev, O. N. 1972. "Neskol'ko drevnix latinsko-slavjanskix parallelej." In *Konferencija po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj grammatike indoevropejskix jazykov (12–14 deakbrja). Predvaritel'nye materialy*, pp. 82–84. Moscow.

Tuchman, Barbara W. 1997. *The March of Folly: From Troy to Vietnam*. London.

Tuite, Kevin. 1998. "Achilles and the Caucasus." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26: 289–344.

Vaan, Michiel Arnoud Cor de. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden.

Valditara, Giuseppe. 1989. *Studi sul magister populi dagli ausiliari militari del rex ai primi magistrati repubblicani*. Milan.

van Buitenen, J. A. B. 1978. *The Mahābhārata*. Volume 3. Chicago.

Van Dusen, Rachel. 2008. *Pentrian Samnites: A History of Social and Political Change in the Central Apennines*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Buffalo (The State University of New York).

Vendryes, Joseph. 1928. "Saint David et le roi Boia." *Revue celtique* 45: 141–172.

Wackernagel, Jacob. 1910. "Indoiranica 9. Zum Dualdvandva." *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 43: 295–298.

Walde, Alois, and Julius Pokorny. 1927. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Volume 2. Berlin.

Walde, Alois, and Julius Pokorny. 1930. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Volume 1. Berlin.

Warde Fowler, W. 1899. *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic*. London.

Warde Fowler, W. 1911. "The Original Meaning of the Word Sacer." *Journal of Roman Studies* 1: 57–63.

Warde Fowler, W. 1913. "Passing under the Yoke." *Classical Review* 27: 48–51.

Warde Fowler, W. 1920. *Roman Essays and Interpretations*. Oxford.

Warren, Minton. 1907. "The Stele Inscription in the Roman Forum." *American Journal of Philology* 28: 249–272.

Watkins, Calvert. 1979. "NAM.RA GUD UDU in Hittite: Indo-European Poetic Language and the Folk Taxonomy of Wealth." *In Neu and Meid* 1979, pp. 269–287.

Watkins, Calvert. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York.

Watkins, Calvert. 2000. *American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. 2nd edition. Boston.

Watson, Alan. 1979. "The Death of Horatia." *Classical Quarterly* 29: 436–447.

Watson, J. Carmichael. 1941. *Mesca Ulad*. Dublin.

Weil, Simone. 2003. *The Iliad or the Poem of Force: A Critical Edition*. Translated and edited by James P. Holoka. New York.

Weinstock, S. 1936. "Nonae Caprotinae." In *Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 17.1:849–859: Stuttgart.

West, M. L. 2009. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.

Westermann, Anton. 1843. *Mythographi Graeci*. Braunschweig.

Whatmough, Joshua. 1922. “A New Epithet of Juno.” *Classical Quarterly* 16: 190.

Whatmough, Joshua. 1923. “Vitvlatio.” *Classical Philology* 18: 350–351.

Whatmough, Joshua. 1931. “The Calendar in Ancient Italy Outside Rome.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 42: 157–179.

Whitney, William Dwight, and Charles Rockwell Lanman. 1905. *Atharva-Veda Saṁhitā*. Cambridge, MA.

Wikander, Stig. 1938. *Der arische Männerbund*. Lund.

Wiseman, T. P. 1970. “The Definition of ‘Eques Romanus’ in the Late Republic and the Early Empire.” *Historia* 19: 67–83.

Wissowa, Georg. 1899. “Caprotina.” In *Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 3.2:1551–1553: Stuttgart.

Wissowa, Georg. 1971. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. Reprint edition. Munich.

Woodard, Roger D. 2002. “The Disruption of Time in Myth and Epic.” *Arethusa* 35: 83–98.

Woodard, Roger D. 2006. *Indo-European Sacred Space*. Urbana and Chicago.

Woodard, Roger D. 2011. “The Roman Regifugium: Myth and Ritual of the King’s Journey Beyond the Boundary.” *In Meurant* 2011, pp. 304–332.

Woolf, Greg. 1998. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge, UK.

Ziołkowski, Adam. 1996. “Of Streets and Crossroads: The Location of the Carinae.” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 41: 121–151.

Ziolkowski, Jan M. 1998. *Obscenity: Social Control and Artistic Creation in the European Middle Ages*. Leiden.

Index

Greek language entries are at the end of the index.
Abazas 154, 167, 204
Abkhazians 157, 167
Actaeon 136, 137
Adonis 136, 271
Aegeum 152
Aegis 134, 163
Aequians 4, 106, 113, 191
Aeschylus 6, 48, 153
aestus 92, 103, 133, 173, 207, 219, 231, 255, 256, 258
aetiology 3, 4, 6, 25, 32, 33, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 78, 85, 88, 89, 95, 97, 98, 100, 104, 105, 109, 111, 112, 114, 116, 118, 119, 128, 129, 137, 160, 161, 176, 189, 192, 193, 194, 195, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 214, 219, 220, 223, 228, 234, 236, 249, 251, 256, 257, 261, 262, 263, 265, 267
Afghanistan 102,
Agamemnon 6, 48
Agastya 164
Ager Romanus 127, 128, 181, 188
Agni 15, 91, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 151, 162, 165, 168, 169, 170, 174, 176, 188, 203, 210, 211, 217, 229, 249, 250, 256
Ahalya 141
Ahuramazda 15,
Ailill 138
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 145, 257
Alba Longa 4, 10, 22, 179, 181, 184, 185, 197, 243
Allia 57, 108, 111
Amazons 132
Anahit 149
Anaxagoras 65
ancilia 113, 193, 235
Ancillarum Feriae 6, 40, 48, 267
Anna Perenna 264, 265,
anus 207,
Anuśāsanaparvan 139, 163
Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra 252, 253
Aphrodite 136

Apollo 6, 109, 118, 136, 225
Apollo Atepomarus 6
aporia 105, 109, 208
apotheosis 37, 42, 50, 52, 75, 79, 80, 88, 105, 107, 199, 219, 222, 233
Appius Claudius Caecus 137, 138
Apsarās 141, 165, 166, 253
Āptyas 179, 241
Apuleius 113
Aquilonia 73
Ara Maxima 82, 93, 138, 189, 194, 231, 232, 236
Aramazd 149
arbor infelix 189
Ardea 47, 108, 110, 111
Ares 154, 155
Aricia 225, 235
Aristeides 211
Aristobulus 51, 52, 55, 87
Aristotle 28
Armilustrium 193, 224
Arnobius 9
Arthur 154, 269, 273
Arunā 254, 255
astrology 144
Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra 248
Aśvamedha 142, 145, 164, 165, 193
Aśvins 192, 242, 253
Atepomarus 6, 105
Atharva Veda 18, 140, 242, 248, 257
Atharva Veda Pariśiṣṭa 248
Athena 133, 134, 135, 136,
Athenaeus 10
Athens 48, 274
Atiedian priests 16, 17, 18
augural books 22
augury 59, 84, 113, 127, 260, 267
August 9, 39, 61, 224, 272
Augustine 44, 66, 68, 72, 93, 178, 212, 232, 264, 274

Augustus 53, 97
Aulus Gellius 9, 27, 28, 62, 82, 127,
Ausonius 69
auspices 22, 113, 115, 127, 233
Avabhṛtha 252, 253, 255

Avaricum 244
Aventine 62, 82, 92, 103, 126, 127, 133, 137, 161, 178, 207, 212, 219, 231, 232, 256, 263
Avesta 17,

Bahrām 149
balam 128, 140, 162, 163, 170, 218, 230, 253, 257, 258
ban-chainte 206, 214
Bartholomae 15, 269
Bataraz 154, 157, 158, 169, 204, 205,
Batraz 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 168, 171, 175, 178, 183, 186, 189, 194, 201, 204, 206, 217, 223, 228, 230, 236, 255, 258, 272
Belgae 245
Bellerophon 132
Beltane 29, 30,
Benveniste, Émile 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 27, 29, 63, 69, 93, 94, 199, 201, 259, 266
berserkir 239
Bhṛgu 163
Black Sea 155
Black Yajurveda 15
blind 138, 207
blindness 135, 136
Bona Dea 92, 103, 126, 134, 135, 137, 138, 161, 162, 173, 174, 177, 178, 180, 189, 207, 208, 214, 227, 231, 250, 255, 256, 257, 266, 270
Book of Leinster 91, 122, 124, 131, 132, 206, 218, 219, 230, 274
Book of the Dun Cow 91, 122, 130, 206, 230, 269
boundary 32, 43, 45, 61, 63, 66, 80, 81, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 100, 101, 109, 113, 114, 115, 121, 124, 127, 128, 129, 139, 140, 141, 143, 145, 146, 147, 161, 162, 163, 181, 182, 184, 186, 188, 194, 199, 202, 206, 228, 236, 240, 241, 247, 249, 250, 251, 252, 260, 267
Bovillae 264, 265
Brahma 164, 253
Brahmahatyā 164, 165, 166, 169, 179,
brahmanicide 145, 146, 164, 170, 179, 241
Brahmavadhyā 164
Brahmins 146, 162, 164, 242, 248, 251, 252, 253
Bratuspantium 245
Bṛhaspati 91, 128, 140, 141, 142, 145, 148, 151, 162, 170, 181, 188, 217, 218, 230, 256, 258, 266
Bricriu 132, 138
Britons 245

Bzhedukhs 157, 158, 159, 160, 205,

Cacus 92, 103, 124, 125, 126, 133, 137, 207, 208, 219, 231,
Cadmus 136
Caelian 224
Calendar of Philocalus 10
Calendar of Polemius Silvius 10, 40
Callimachus 135, 136, 270, 271
Camenae 235
Camerini 60
Camillus 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 189, 233, 236, 262, 271
Campus Martius 8, 33, 37, 43, 45, 47, 48, 50, 61, 62, 67, 76, 78, 80, 81, 88, 89, 128, 129, 177, 184, 192, 193, 199, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 228, 235, 256, 258, 260, 261, 266, 267
caper 220
Capitoline 9, 13, 19, 27, 58, 82, 93, 95, 97, 111, 113, 201, 226, 263,
Capitoline Arx 97
capra 220, 221
Caprae Palus 8, 33, 37, 41, 42, 47, 49, 99, 177, 219, 220, 222, 225, 228, 256, 261, 267
caprificus 5, 6, 7, 8, 33, 39, 41, 49, 177, 209, 267
Carinae 190
Carmenta 231
Carmina Marciana 224
Carmina Saliaria 19, 193
Cassandra 48
Cassius Dio 27, 64
Castor 125
Cato 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 25
Caucasus 139, 153, 157, 160, 167, 168, 186, 202, 204, 230, 258, 270, 276
Celts 29, 244, 245, 249
Censorinus 96
centuriones 73
ceremonial bath 251, 254, 256,
Ceres 19, 32, 263, 264, 275
Çerfus Martius 16, 19,
Cerus 19,
Chariclo 135, 136
childbirth 152, 153, 157
Chilon 64
Chimarrhus 132
Cicero 2, 21, 36, 37, 42, 48, 58, 59, 60, 85, 137, 138, 190, 197, 222,

260
Cincinnatus 191
Circassians 154, 155, 157, 158, 167, 168, 169, 205, 217, 258
Circus Flaminius 61
Circus Maximus 9, 34, 65, 66, 82, 200, 212, 223, 225, 232
clairvoyant woman 92, 100, 101, 134, 139, 143, 158, 159, 169, 185, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 210, 211, 214, 215, 236, 240, 251, 258, 266
Claudius 82, 127
Claudius Quadrigarius 108
Clivus Capitolinus 71

Cloaca 82, 224,
Clodius 52, 138
Clytemnestra 6
Columella 8, 24, 26, 28, 32
Columna Bellica 184
comitia 53, 54, 59, 62, 63, 76, 80, 113
comitia centuriata 62, 63
comitia curiata 53, 94
comitia tributa 62
Comitium 43, 47, 50, 53, 54, 56, 57, 61, 62, 63, 68, 71, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 114, 128, 223, 225, 226, 227, 228, 233, 235, 250, 255, 256, 260, 261, 266, 269
Conchobor 92, 121, 123, 130, 131, 133, 163, 184, 185, 194, 206, 214, 218, 230, 236, 274
Connacht 138, 171, 172
Consualia 9
Consus 9, 34, 65, 66, 82, 200, 212
continuum 107, 109, 111, 118,
contio 54
Corinth 64
Cornelius Scipio 68
Corybantic rites 55
cowherds 23, 30
Cremera 57,
Creon 64
Crimthann Nia Náir 133
Cronus 136
Crustumerium 4
Crypta of Balbus 61, 222
CúChulainn 91, 92, 96, 97, 101, 103, 109, 121, 122, 123, 124, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 138, 154, 160, 161, 166, 168, 171, 172, 176, 177, 179, 183, 184, 185, 186, 189, 194, 206, 207, 209, 214, 218,

219, 223, 227, 230, 236, 239, 244, 247, 250, 252, 255, 258, 266
Cumae 225
Cumaean Sibyl 207
Curatius 197
Cures 126, 195, 199, 232, 233, 234, 236
curia 26, 94, 197, 199
Curia 50, 51, 53
Curia Calabra 97
Curia Hostilia 50, 53, 113
curiae 53, 94, 198,
Curiae 236
Curiae Veteres 82
Curiatii 10, 101, 179, 181, 183, 184, 186, 188, 197,
curio 197
curis 46, 195, 196, 197
Curule Aedile 96

Dakṣināgni 54, 80
Dea Dia 128, 181
December 9, 38, 138, 227
Declona 197
Deirdre 92, 206
delba 132, 171, 230
Delphi 109
Demeter 79, 263
Devayajana 80
dharma 140
di certi 44
di incerti 44
di selecti 44

Diana 13, 137, 235
dictator 4, 21, 22, 24, 106, 108, 111, 191, 243
dies comitiales 96
dies fasti 70, 96
dies fissi 71,
dies nefasti 70, 96
Dīkṣā 252, 253
Diodorus Siculus 107, 231
Diogenes Laertius 28, 64
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 2, 4, 10, 29, 37, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 60, 65, 66, 67, 76, 80, 85, 88, 104, 112, 115, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 186, 189, 190, 195, 197, 199, 213, 221, 231, 243, 261, 263, 264
Dionysus 51, 263, 275
Diopeithes 55,
distant locale 85, 90, 91, 92, 97, 99, 100, 101, 103, 105, 109, 110, 111, 115, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 137, 145, 156, 162, 163, 169, 172, 175, 177, 181, 183, 184, 202, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 223, 227, 230, 233, 234, 235, 239, 241, 249, 254, 256, 258, 262, 267, 269
Dius Fidius 126
divination 91, 115, 142, 143, 148, 161, 169, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 210, 211, 214, 215, 229
Donbettyr 156, 206, 217
dragons 91, 103, 120, 121, 124, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 156, 161, 173, 175, 176, 183, 194, 216, 218, 228, 230
dṛṣṭiviṣa 140, 253, 257
Druids 121, 133,
Dryads 13
Duenos Inscription 212
Dumézil, Georges 1, 3, 9, 11, 12, 26, 31, 32, 54, 79, 90, 93, 94, 101, 108, 132, 142, 144, 146, 147, 150, 153, 155, 159, 171, 175, 179, 183, 192, 193, 198, 201, 205, 234, 241, 243
duumviri 187, 189
dysfunctional warrior 82, 83, 90, 91, 92, 93, 101, 103, 111, 115, 118, 120, 124, 129, 130, 132, 134, 137, 139, 143, 147, 155, 160, 162, 166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 179, 183, 185, 187, 188, 189, 193, 194, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 205, 207, 208, 209, 210, 216, 218, 227, 229, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 247, 249, 250, 251, 255, 257, 258, 260, 261, 262, 266, 268

eclipse 36, 41, 99, 222, 225

Egeria 66, 235,
Egnatus Cossutius 197
Eileithyia 152,
Electra 153
Emain Macha 91, 103, 122, 123, 128, 130, 133, 134, 138, 154, 171, 177, 184, 185, 206, 214, 218, 266
endotercisus 71
Ennius 212
enunciation 7, 10, 15, 20, 24, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 63, 65, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 91, 97, 98, 99, 128, 129, 130, 162, 177, 178, 211, 212, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 264, 268
Enyalius 195
Eochaid Airem 214
Epiphany 39
Equus October 26, 27, 164, 193
Eros 180
Erymanthus 136,
Erytheia 124
Etruscans 2, 3, 4, 9, 35, 44, 84, 86, 88, 98, 105, 106, 107, 109
Eumaeus 48
Euripides 152
Evander 124, 127, 231
evocatio 213
extra-pomerial space 33, 266

faba 26, 27, 28, 29
Fabius Pictor 45
Faliscans 110
fandus 72, 73, 74
Fannall 91, 122, 123, 219
fari 69, 70, 72, 76, 259,
fas 56, 69, 70, 71, 80, 115, 174, 259,
Fasti Amiternini 40, 225
Fasti Antiates maiores 9, 31, 32, 71, 261
Fasti Antiates Ministrorum domus Augustae 40, 225
Fasti Caeretani 71
Fasti fratrum Arvalium 192, 196
Fasti Maffeiani 40, 71, 225
Fasti Praenestini 71, 97
Fasti Tusculani 71
Fasti Vaticani 71
Fasti Venusini 71
fastus 69, 70, 71, 74, 135
Faunus 13, 233

Faustulus 23, 57, 58, 76
February 2, 36, 43, 47, 57, 79, 83, 90, 94, 95, 98, 102, 224
fecundity 9, 13, 34, 35, 118, 149, 175, 177, 178, 200, 213, 236, 256, 261, 263, 266, 267
female nudity 92, 93, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 161, 167, 168, 169, 171, 173, 177, 185, 201, 207, 208, 214, 218, 230, 244, 245, 247, 249, 250, 251, 266
feminine eroticism 100, 101, 118, 138, 139, 160, 164, 168, 170, 171, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 186, 189, 193, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 204, 207, 208, 210, 212, 214, 215, 240, 242, 243, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 253, 254, 257, 265, 267
Férach 130, 163
ferg 124, 130, 131, 132, 138, 154, 171, 172, 176, 183, 186, 189, 218, 227, 230, 255, 258, 266
ferocior 181
feroculus 186
ferox 181, 182, 186, 194, 257
fertility 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 28, 33, 34, 65, 94, 117, 119, 167, 201, 210, 213, 215, 228, 242, 243, 245, 248, 253, 263, 265
ferus 181, 182, 186
Festus 10, 23, 46, 57, 58, 60, 69, 71, 80, 87, 93, 96, 125, 184, 190, 197, 227, 235, 264
Fetiales 10, 184
Ficulea 2, 3, 39, 44, 105, 274
Fidenae 2, 4, 39, 44, 105, 243, 274
Finnabair 138
fire 6, 37, 51, 52, 54, 55, 61, 67, 76, 80, 86, 87, 91, 106, 107, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 150, 151, 152, 155, 156, 157, 160, 165, 168, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 182, 189, 201, 208, 210, 211, 212, 217, 222, 229, 248, 249, 250, 251, 255, 256
Fire 54, 55, 76, 88, 142, 143, 145, 147, 151, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171, 174, 175, 176, 188, 210, 217, 249, 250, 251, 254, 256, 258, 260, 271
Fisovius Sancius 16, 19,
Fisus Sancius 19, 20
Flamen Dialis 23, 27, 28, 93, 94, 113, 251
Flamen Martialis 23, 27, 93, 94
Flamen Palatualis 10, 30
Flamen Quirinalis 9, 93, 94
Flamines 9, 34
Flamines Maiores 93,
Flamines Minores 9
Fled Bricrenn 138
Flight of the Throng 35, 38, 42

flight of the warrior 83, 93, 94, 95, 101, 109, 110, 121, 123, 124, 145, 147, 154, 161, 206, 207, 218, 219, 241
Florus 8, 109, 222
Foill 91, 122, 123
Fordicidia 26,
Fors Fortuna 39
Forum 42, 53, 54, 58, 60, 62, 67, 75, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 96, 113, 114, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 276
Forum Boarium 82, 223, 231
Frater Atiieřiur 16
Fratres Arvales 91, 128, 181, 186
Frazer 132
Frusino 225

Fugalia 178,
funestus 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 76, 80, 89, 235, 260, 262
furor 92, 133, 171, 172, 177, 193, 199, 205, 218, 229, 234, 241, 245, 256
Furrinalia 39

Gaius Curiatius 197
Gauls 2, 3, 4, 6, 39, 44, 49, 57, 98, 105, 106, 108, 111, 112, 113, 244
Gautama Dharmaśāstra 248
gaze 102, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141, 158, 159, 161, 163, 164, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 173, 178, 179, 180, 182, 184, 185, 186, 189, 194, 201, 205, 207, 208, 218, 229, 230, 245, 246, 247, 248, 250, 251, 253, 257, 258, 259, 260, 262, 266
geis 122, 123, 219
Gergovia 244, 245,
ghoradṛṣṭi 140, 166, 186, 248
Gnaeus Flavius 96, 98
Goat Nones 33, 48, 200, 262
Goat's Marsh 8, 33, 36, 37, 41, 42, 43, 47, 49, 99, 177, 219, 220, 221, 222, 225, 256, 261, 267
Gobhila Smṛti 259
Gregorian calendar 38

haruspices 88
Helenius Acro 56
Helvia 75
Hephaestus 53
Heracles 126, 137, 149, 216, 231
Hercules 82, 92, 101, 103, 119, 124, 125, 126, 127, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 160, 161, 162, 163, 166, 168, 173, 178, 186, 189, 194, 207, 209, 214, 219, 223, 231, 232, 236, 244

herdsmen 24, 48
Herodian 50, 51
Herodotus 48, 154,
Heurgon, Jacques 31, 272
Himalayas 91, 111, 121, 203
Hippocrates 153, 180
History of the Armenians 148, 275,
Hittites 168, 252, 276
Homer 63
homicide 37, 42, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 75, 79, 88, 103, 104, 105, 107, 124, 146, 147, 155, 157, 158, 159, 164, 169, 183, 187, 188, 189, 198, 205, 217, 218, 220, 230, 241
Horace 27, 56, 207, 271
Horatia 164, 166, 179, 180, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 194, 199, 200, 257, 276
Horatii 10, 179, 181, 184,
Horatius 83, 166, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 197, 198, 199, 201, 209, 218, 234, 236, 243, 257,
Hostius Hostilius 58
Hostus Hostilius 58, 60, 76, 85
Hurrians 168

Ibod 121, 123, 154, 184
Ides 1, 27, 193, 264, 273
Iguvine Tablets 16
Iguvium 16, 18, 19
in Campo. *See* Campus Martius
in Comitio. *See* Comitium
inauguration 100, 101, 115, 192, 229, 230, 233, 234, 235, 236, 240
inauspicious day 44, 57, 83, 96, 193, 266
Indo-European xii, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 34, 46, 54, 74, 83, 87, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 109, 111, 115, 117, 118, 120, 128, 129, 130, 132, 137, 138, 139, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 153, 157, 160, 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 172, 173, 176, 178, 179, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188, 192, 193, 194, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 214, 216, 218, 220, 223, 227, 229, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276, 277
Indra 91, 92, 95, 101, 103, 111, 120, 121, 124, 128, 133, 134, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153,

154, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 174, 179, 181, 183, 188, 192, 194, 202, 203, 208, 209, 210, 211, 216, 218, 223, 227, 229, 232, 236, 239, 241, 242, 243, 248, 249, 253, 254, 255, 256, 258, 266, 269, 272
indriyam 242, 253
insanity 152
Iobates 132
ira 133, 173, 207, 219, 231, 255, 256, 258, 265,
Iraq 102, 103,
Isis 233
Isocrates 75
Italic peoples 29
Ithaca 48, 270, 273
iugum 191, 192, 241
ius 62, 63, 71, 82
iuvenis 190

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa 145
Janiculum 67
January 38, 39, 102, 195, 227
Janus Curiatius 190, 194, 196, 197
Janus Junonius 195
Johannes Lydus 28, 84
Josephus 192
Julius Caesar 24, 53, 138, 244, 245
Julius Proculus 42, 52, 88

July xii, 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 48, 49, 50, 51, 57, 65, 79, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 109, 119, 128, 129, 176, 177, 198, 200, 209, 210, 212, 214, 219, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 228, 234, 243, 249, 251, 255, 257, 261, 266, 267, 274
Juno 8, 33, 79, 126, 189, 190, 195, 196, 197, 198, 267, 276
Juno Caprotina 7, 8, 33, 39, 79, 177, 200, 256, 267
Juno Covella 97
Juno Curitis 196, 197
Juno Paloscaria 8
Juno Quiritis 196, 197
Juno Sororia 190, 194, 197, 198
Jupiter 9, 12, 13, 16, 18, 23, 27, 28, 58, 59, 73, 93, 113, 125, 235, 260, 263, 264, 267
Jupiter Grabovius 16, 18
Juppiter Territor 267
Juvenal 173, 175, 180

Kādambarī 203

Kalends 1, 3, 33, 96, 97, 192, 193, 195, 196, 201, 234, 250, 261
Kauśika Sūtra 248
Khimish 157, 158, 159, 160, 168, 169, 205,
krūra- 242
kṣatriya 242
Kurdalægon 156

la classe des cultivateurs 13, 29, 119, 201, 242, 243, 256, 260, 261, 262, 266, 267
la classe des guerriers 14, 27, 119, 238, 248, 255, 256, 260, 261, 262, 266
la classe des prêtres 12, 261, 262, 266, 268
la deuxième fonction 14, 27, 28, 94, 95, 119, 200, 238, 239, 242, 255, 265
la première fonction 12, 26, 27, 28, 94, 95,
la troisième fonction 9, 13, 28, 94, 95, 118, 119, 200, 201, 234, 242, 243, 260, 263, 266, 268
Lactantius 68, 93, 232, 233
Laelius Felix 62
Lanuvium 22, 107

larger Poplifugium 88, 89, 117, 128, 177, 223, 228, 235, 266
Latins 4, 6, 44, 48, 105, 106, 116, 117, 161, 177, 208, 209, 213, 233, 269
Latium 2, 8, 39, 272, 274,
Lebor Buide Lecáin 91, 122,
Lebor Laignech 91
Lebor na hUidre 91, 122,
Leborcham 92, 139, 185, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 214, 218
les trois classes 11
les trois fonctions 11
lex sacra 60, 197
Liber 263
Libera 263
Liberalia 264, 265,
lightning 58, 59, 75, 81, 100, 120, 121, 155, 156, 170, 225, 248, 260
lituus 115, 116, 233
livestock 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 28, 31, 32, 34
Livius Postumius 4
Livy 3, 4, 8, 10, 23, 42, 45, 47, 53, 57, 58, 61, 68, 73, 74, 81, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 138, 179, 181, 182, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 197, 199, 213, 222, 224, 225, 233, 234, 235, 243, 261, 264, 273, 274
Lóeg 133,
lotus 111, 121, 134, 142, 143, 150, 151, 161, 164, 169, 174, 181, 202, 208, 216
Lucian 28, 75, 180
Lucius Aelius Stilo 125
Lucius Apuleius 109
Ludi Apollinares 79, 224, 225
Lupercalia 7, 8,
Luvians 252
Lycians 132
Lysias 75

Macrobius 3, 4, 8, 35, 40, 41, 44, 71, 96, 97, 98, 105, 177, 191, 195, 209, 213, 225
madness 83, 124, 130, 153, 172, 193, 194, 237, 239, 240, 244, 249
maenads 166, 174, 179, 186, 200, 207
magister 21, 22, 23, 24, 276
magister equitum 21, 22, 23, 27
magister pecoris 21, 23, 24
magister populi 21, 22, 23, 27
Magna Graecia 137
Mahābhārata 91, 121, 128, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146,

147, 148, 151, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 168, 170, 171, 202, 203, 210, 216, 242, 253, 254, 271, 272, 276
Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā 241, 252, 253
Mamuralia 43, 83, 85, 90, 93, 95, 96, 193, 224, 235
Mamurius Veturius 47, 83, 85, 90, 193, 235
Mānava Dharmaśāstra 248
mania 131, 132, 152, 218, 230, 254,
Männerbünde 238, 239
mantra 258, 259
March 36, 43, 71, 83, 90, 95, 113, 193, 224, 235, 263, 264, 265, 273, 276
Marcus Baebius 68
Marcus Tafanius 197
Mars 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 23, 27, 45, 46, 54, 81, 83, 85, 87, 93, 113, 114, 128, 181, 182, 186, 193, 200, 201, 221, 233, 235, 265, 266

Martial 219
Martianus Capella 9
Maruquo 158, 159
masses 38, 42, 43, 47, 48, 55, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 79, 80, 85, 88, 94, 95, 97, 109, 110, 112, 185, 199, 201, 242, 255, 258, 260, 262, 263, 264, 265, 268
matrix 100, 115, 117, 118, 130, 138, 139, 183, 202, 214, 215, 216, 229, 235, 236, 239, 240
May 30, 36, 71, 224
Mazdaism 150
Medb 138
Menakā 253
mental disturbance 93, 103, 133, 173
Mercury Atepomarus 6
Mesca Ulad 133, 214, 276
Mettius Fuffetius 243
military specialist 43, 83, 92, 98, 101, 129, 176
Minerva 265,
Minor Capitoline triad 263
Modius Fabidius 196, 199
Mons Algidus 191
Mons Sacer 263, 264
Moses of Chorene 148, 149, 174, 216, 228
Mt. Helicon 135
Mugain 130, 131, 163, 177, 186, 230
Mukara 156
Murrius 31,

Nahuṣa 91, 111, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 160, 161, 162, 163, 166, 169, 170, 171, 183, 186, 189, 202, 203, 210, 229, 248, 250, 252, 253, 272
Namuci 146, 242, 253
Narts 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 167, 168, 169, 175, 176, 186, 189, 194, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 215, 216, 217, 223, 230, 236, 258, 270
Near East 5
Nechta Scéne 91, 103, 122, 123, 124, 133, 154, 172, 179, 183, 184, 185, 206, 219
nefandus 72, 73, 74, 76
nefaria 72
nefas 56, 59, 62, 63, 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 80, 89, 110, 113, 115, 137, 213, 235, 260, 262
nefastus 70, 71, 74, 76, 111
Neptunalia 39, 48
Neptune 65
Nestor 174
Niger Lapis 45, 57, 58, 59, 60, 76, 80, 84, 86, 87, 260, 267
Night 161, 202, 203
Niśā 202
niti 203,
Nomentum 4
Nonae Capratinae 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 99, 114, 116, 196, 221,
Nonae Caprotinae 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 31, 33, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 48, 65, 95, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 107, 109, 117, 129, 160, 176, 177, 178, 198, 199, 200, 202, 208, 212, 215, 220, 223, 225, 236, 256, 257, 261, 263, 267, 268, 276
nonaria 7, 257
Nones 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 48, 51, 65, 96, 97, 98, 99, 196, 261, 268, 274
Nonis Quinctilibus 36
Nonnus 136
Northwest Caucasians 157, 158, 168,
November 102, 224
Numa 1, 10, 33, 46, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 104, 113, 234, 235, 261, 267
nymphs 13, 235

October 26, 27, 36, 192, 193, 194, 196, 201, 224, 234, 250, 274
Oedipus 64, 68, 74
ojas 166
Old Christmas 38, 39
omens 57, 58, 59, 113, 114, 122, 127, 233, 248, 260

Opalia 9
Opiconsivia 9
Ops 9, 243,
optimus 58, 59, 60, 76, 80, 85, 260,
Orchomenus 52
order 93
Orestes 153
Orphic mysteries 173,
Ossets 130, 139, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161, 167, 168, 169, 175, 176, 189, 204, 205, 208, 217, 223, 228, 230, 270
Ovid 6, 8, 10, 12, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 36, 37, 45, 57, 98, 105, 124, 133, 195, 197, 207, 219, 221, 224, 235, 264, 265, 267, 270, 271, 273,
Ovile 63
Ovius Paccius 73, 74

Palatine 10, 32, 34, 58, 82, 85, 86, 89, 92, 103, 114, 124, 127, 128, 207, 208, 225, 231, 250, 266, 267
Pales 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 79, 200
Palibus II 9, 31, 32, 33, 261, 267
Palladium 113
Pallas 134, 163
palus 219
Pantheon 63, 222
Pap 151
Parilia 10, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 267
pastoralist-cultivators 11, 14, 15, 29
Pataraz 155, 157, 159, 160, 168, 169, 205
Patres Conscripti 51

patricians 42, 50, 51, 54, 62, 88, 96, 105, 268
Paulus Diaconus 125
Pausanias 152
perduellio 187, 198
Periander 64
Persephone 79, 263
Persius 7
Philotis 4, 107, 202, 204, 208, 209, 212, 215
Phrynichus 55
physical force 14, 15, 27, 28, 34, 94, 117, 119, 120, 200, 201, 210, 238, 239, 242, 245, 258, 266,
Pisistratids 48
Pisistratus 48

Pisistratus of Orchomenus 52
Plato 75
plebeian secession 263
Plebeian Tribune 109, 110, 117, 197, 264
plebs 62, 96, 97, 109, 112, 114, 117, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268,
Pliny 26, 27, 28, 29, 66, 68, 96, 213, 224, 245
Plutarch 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 23, 27, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 57, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 75, 76, 80, 81, 83, 88, 89, 96, 98, 99, 105, 106, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 118, 119, 129, 132, 138, 173, 177, 196, 197, 208, 213, 220, 222, 223, 225, 231, 233, 234, 235, 257, 261,
Polycrates 48
pomerium 32, 33, 34, 45, 47, 61, 62, 63, 81, 82, 85, 86, 87, 89, 109, 113, 127, 128, 129, 133, 187, 188, 199, 207, 208, 209, 219, 225, 231, 250, 256, 260, 266, 267, 273, 275
Pompeia 138
Pompey 64, 222
Pomponius Porphyrio 56
Pontifex Maximus 57, 75, 112
Pontifical College 97
Pontifices 26, 27, 44, 45, 67, 109, 112, 189, 191
Pontifices Minores 96, 97,
Poplifugia xiv, 1, 2, 3, 4, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 60, 61, 79, 83, 84, 88, 89, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 107, 109, 111, 114, 116, 117, 128, 129, 176, 178, 195, 196, 198, 199, 209, 213, 224, 225, 234, 235, 236, 255, 256, 257, 261, 263, 268
poplifugium 36, 37, 43, 48, 55, 76, 79
populus 10, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 33, 35, 39, 43, 44, 47, 51, 52, 54, 55, 59, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 76, 80, 85, 88, 89, 95, 97, 98, 105, 109, 110, 112, 113, 117, 128, 129, 177, 178, 184, 185, 187, 189, 194, 198, 199, 221, 225, 234, 250, 262, 264, 265, 266, 268,
Populus 194
populus Romanus 34, 35, 48, 49, 50, 56, 76, 85, 98, 110, 111, 113, 115, 117, 118, 128, 177, 199, 228, 233, 255, 256, 258, 262, 267
Porta Capena 181, 235
Porta Collina 225
porta triumphalis 192,
portents 18, 225
Portunalia 39
Poseidon 132
Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder xi, 102, 240
Praeneste 8

Praetor Urbanus 68, 70
Praxiteles 180
prayer 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 34, 128, 248, 266
Pre-Capitoline triad 13, 27, 93, 95, 201, 233, 243, 263
Prestota Çerfia 16, 19,
Priapus 174,
priest-magicians 12, 13, 15, 26, 214, 266
priests 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 23, 26, 27, 28, 73, 74, 91, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 128, 140, 151, 162, 188, 192, 197, 207, 214, 219, 230, 241, 249, 251, 252, 253, 256, 258, 262, 266,
Proculus Julius 42, 234
proditio 187
Propertius 29, 58, 92, 119, 124, 125, 126, 127, 133, 137, 138, 163, 207, 208, 219, 232, 272
Ps-Plutarch 6, 40, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 80, 85, 86, 98, 105, 211, 212
Ptolomaeus Chennus 136
Publicus Cornelius 68
Pythagoreans 28, 67

Q. Petilius 68
Q.R.C.F. 71
Q.REX.C.F. 71
Q.S.D.F. 71
Q.ST.D.F. 71
Quinquatrus 39, 54, 265
Quintilis 36, 40, 48, 51, 261
Quintus Lucienus 31
Quirinalia 36
Quirinus 9, 13, 19, 37, 42, 46, 93, 94, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 232, 233, 234, 243, 256
Quirites 94, 189, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 232, 234, 258

rage xii, 83, 92, 93, 101, 103, 120, 123, 124, 128, 129, 130, 132, 133, 138, 139, 141, 147, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 169, 171, 172, 173, 176, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 186, 198, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 214, 217, 218, 219, 229, 230, 231, 237, 239, 240, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 258, 260, 265
rāj- 151
Rātrī 202
Reate 195
reed 150, 151, 153, 172, 175, 194, 218, 219

Regia 82, 84, 226
regifugium 1, *see* Regifugium

Regifugium 2, 3, 43, 47, 54, 79, 83, 85, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 178, 235, 277
Remus 8, 23, 58, 76, 127
rex 2, 22, 26, 36, 60, 71, 95, 97, 98, 151, 222, 276
Rex Sacrificulus 71

Rex Sacrorum 2, 22, 43, 47, 54, 71, 83, 85, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 261, 268
Rhetana 6, 211, 215
Riastartha 172
ríastrad 171
Riches 133, 214, 250
Rig Veda 91, 120, 121, 145, 216, 243, 253, 259
Romaea 10, 267
Romulus 4, 8, 10, 23, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 65, 66, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 88, 89, 93, 95, 97, 98, 99, 104, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 127, 128, 129, 176, 196, 197, 199, 201, 207, 209, 212, 213, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 228, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 255, 256, 260, 262, 267, 272
Rostra 56, 58

Sabines 4, 19, 46, 53, 58, 65, 66, 77, 82, 93, 125, 195, 196, 199, 213, 232, 233, 234, 243, 260, 267
Sacellum Larum 82
sacer 191, 192, 264
sacerdotes 9, 73, 200, 212
Śacī 91, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 160, 161, 162, 163, 166, 168, 169, 170, 174, 183, 186, 188, 202, 203, 210, 211, 229, 248, 249
Saepta 63
Sajnæg Ældar 158
sakhā 242, 243, 253
Śakra 145, 164
Salii 19, 54, 113, 193, 224, 235, 243
Salus 213
Śalyaparvan 253
Samians 48
Samnites 73, 275, 276
Śāntiparvan 139, 143, 148, 164, 165, 175, 203, 211
Sarasvatī 192, 242, 253
Sarmatians 153
Satana 156, 158, 160, 161, 163, 167, 169, 176, 203, 204, 206, 208, 215, 217
Satanaya 167, 203, 204, 217, 270
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 121, 145, 146, 147, 192, 241, 242, 249, 252, 258, 271
Saturnus 243,
Sautrāmaṇī 192,

Sawseruquo 168, 217
Scannlach 131, 163, 177, 186, 230
Scipio Africanus 51
scourging 187, 188
Scythians 139, 153, 154, 230
Second Equirria 43, 47, 83, 90, 96, 193, 224
seduction 6
seers 83, 91, 118, 121, 128, 134, 140, 141, 143, 145, 151, 160, 162, 163, 170, 175, 188, 204, 217, 224, 229, 248, 253, 257, 266
Segesta 66
Segetia 66, 212
Seia 66, 212
Semo Sancus 19, 92, 93, 103, 119, 125, 126, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 160, 161, 163, 166, 168, 173, 178, 186, 189, 194, 202, 207, 209, 214, 219, 223, 227, 231, 232, 233, 236, 239, 244, 250, 255, 256, 257, 258
Semo Sancus Dius Fidius 19, 125, 126, 233
Semones 182, 233
Semonia 213
Senate 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 68, 72, 76, 81, 111, 113, 221
Senators 51, 52, 61, 76, 80, 88, 114
Seneca 21
sensuality 28, 94, 117, 118, 119, 200, 210, 228, 242, 263
Servian walls 86, 127, 128
Servius 9, 24, 27, 97, 184, 196
Servius Tullius 62
Setenaya 167, 168, 217
Severan Marble Plan 61, 222
sex 28, 33, 41, 105, 112, 118, 139, 156, 160, 161, 163, 165, 167, 174, 175, 176, 178, 200, 204, 217, 236, 253, 259, 264
sexuality 33, 160, 165, 178, 263, 265, 266
Sgamalus 131
Sheela-na-gig 246, 247, 248
shepherds 10, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 167
Sibylline Books 225, 263
Silius Italicus 133
slaves 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 20, 21, 23, 24, 33, 40, 42, 43, 48, 49, 105, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 129, 160, 161, 174, 176, 177, 178, 200, 202, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 243, 257,
slave-women 4, 6, 7, 8, 33, 39, 40, 42, 48, 49, 105, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 129, 160, 161, 176, 177, 178, 200, 202, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 243, 257, 267,
Sliab Fúait 121
smaller Poplifugium 84, 85, 88, 117, 128, 223, 228, 235, 250, 266

smith 100, 146, 156, 168
snātaka 248, 252
social isolationism 102, 103, 111, 120, 124, 129, 162, 239, 250, 254,
societal order 229, 230, 231, 233, 234, 236, 237, 255
socius 243

solitaurilia 46
Soma 145, 147, 252, 255, 257, 258, 259
Song of Vahagn 151
Sophists 180
Sophocles 64, 68, 74
sorcery 144, 158, 160, 167, 169, 204, 205, 206, 207, 250, 251, 266
sororium tigillum 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 257
Sororium Tigillum 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 198, 199, 201, 234, 236, 241, 250
Soslan 168,
Sosruquo 154
spolia opima 46,
St. George's Day 30
Strabo 235
śudra 259
Suetonius 24,
suicide 102
suovetaurilia 46, 192
surā 242
Sutrium 4, 106, 107
Syrdon 156,

Tacitus 57, 59, 82, 85, 269, 273, 274
Táin Bó Cúailnge 91, 122, 123, 124, 130, 131, 172, 218, 219, 230, 252, 274
Taittirīya Saṃhitā 15, 17, 121, 146
tapas 252, 253, 255
Tarquinius Priscus 3, 224
Tarquinius Superbus 45, 47, 224
Tartars 191
Tefer Jovius 16, 18
tejas 140, 162, 171, 248, 253,
Telemachus 47
Tellus 26, 27
Temple of Castor 82
Temple of Vesta 67, 71, 82, 84, 226
Tertullian 9, 66, 212, 213
Theophrastus 28

Theseus 64, 68
Thesmophoria 79
third estate 13, 14, 29, 94, 118, 200, 201, 234, 242, 258, 260
Thraētaona 183,
Tibullus 29
Tigran 151
Tiran 151
Tiresias 134, 135, 136, 138, 161, 163, 207, 208, 273
Titinus 212,
Titus Tatius 53, 58, 61, 76, 80, 81, 82, 85, 88, 126, 232, 243, 260
Tlepsh 168
Tlesimachus 52
Tochmarc Étaíne 214
traumatized warrior 99, 121, 128, 131, 140, 157, 160, 161, 164, 165, 166, 170, 176, 200, 202, 214, 228, 240
tricephal slayer 90, 133, 146, 170, 179, 183, 192, 198, 208, 231, 232, 241
tripartite ideology 13, 93, 94, 95, 98, 118, 200, 201, 262, 263,
Triśiras 146, 170, 179, 183, 192
Trita Āptya 146, 179, 183, 241
Troezen 152
Tuachell 91, 122, 123,
túath 247
Tullus Hostilius 10, 46, 53, 58, 164, 179, 181, 187, 192, 197, 243
Turpilius 186
Tutela 4, 202, 209, 212, 213,
Tutilina 212, 213
Tutinus 212
Tutola 4, 202, 208, 212, 213
Tutula 4, 7, 41, 43, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 160, 163, 176, 177, 202, 204, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 267
Tutulina 65, 66, 212, 213
Tutunus 212
Tvaṣṭṛ 146, 147, 164, 192
Twelve Tables 187

Ubykhs 154, 167
Udyogaparvan 139, 143, 144, 164, 165, 175, 203, 210
Ulaid 122, 123, 124, 133, 138, 171, 172, 185, 189, 194, 206, 218, 230, 266
Ullikummi 168
Ulster 91, 121, 123, 130, 132, 138, 161, 184, 185, 186, 205, 206, 214, 218, 236, 250
Umbrians 119, 137

un-Indra 161
Upaśruti 91, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 148, 161, 162, 163, 168, 169, 174, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 214, 229, 249

Vahagn 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 168, 174, 176, 178, 189, 194, 216, 218, 223, 228, 230, 236, 271
Vahrām 149
Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā 242
Valerius Maximus 46, 68,
Vārāha Gṛhya Puruṣa 248
Varro 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 21, 22, 24, 28, 31, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 48, 53, 56, 59, 70, 71, 72, 97, 98, 105, 125, 177, 193, 195, 197, 212, 213, 219, 264
Veii 4, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 243
Velabrum 226
Velitrae 225
Velletri 197

Venus 27, 174, 265,
Venus of Eryx 225
Vercingetorix 244
Vərəθraγna 149, 150
Verrius Flaccus 47
Vesta 25, 26, 67, 113, 261
Vestal Virgins 9, 25, 26, 67, 75, 97, 113, 235
Vestalia 39
Victimarii 68, 261
Vicus Tuscus 82
Villa Publica 63
Virgil 23, 26, 96, 124
vīryam 242, 253
Viṣṇu 142, 145, 249
Viśvāmitra 253
Viśvarupa 146, 147, 170, 179
Vitellius 57,
Vitruvius 61, 81, 85, 88, 225
Vitula 35, 44
vitulatio 35, 44, 45,
Volcanal 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 63, 76, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 128, 212, 226, 227, 235, 250, 255, 256, 260, 266
Volcanalia 61
Volscians 4, 94, 106, 113, 197,
Vṛtra 91, 92, 103, 120, 124, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 164, 166, 170, 175, 183, 216, 218, 229, 241, 254, 269

Vṛtrahan 91, 149, 150, 151, 153, 164, 166, 169, 174, 194, 208, 218
Vulcan 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 67, 75, 76, 80, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 212, 222, 226, 235, 249, 256, 260

warrior-in-crisis 33, 35, 49, 90, 93, 98, 101, 104, 105, 109, 111, 117, 128, 130, 143, 145, 148, 150, 163, 166, 176, 183, 199, 209, 210, 211, 216, 219, 223, 229, 231, 232, 234, 236, 239, 262
watery locale 92, 124, 130, 132, 134, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 148, 150, 151, 155, 156, 162, 169, 173, 175, 189, 206, 208, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 223, 227, 229, 236, 251, 254, 256, 261, 262, 266

Xæmyts 155, 156, 158, 168, 169, 176, 204, 205, 217,

Yellow Book of Lecan 91, 122, 130, 206, 230, 272, 275
yoke 191

Zartyzh 167

Αἴλιος Πρᾶος 52, 80, 256
ἀπόρρητα 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 75, 261
ἀπόρρητος 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 74, 75, 76, 81, 88, 186, 212, 235,
εἴρω 74
ἐρῶ 211, 212
θέμις 69,
θέμιστος 69
θεμιτά 135, 137
μῦθος 63, 105, 108
μυθώδης 105, 107
οὐ θέμις 69,
οὐ θεμιτόν 64, 69, 70, 72
ῥῆμα 211
ῥῆσις 211
ῥητός 211